



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL  
OF  
SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES  
(CONTINUING HEBRAICA)

VOLUME XXIV

APRIL, 1908

NUMBER 3

THE ARAMAIC PORTIONS OF EZRA

By C. C. TORREY  
Yale University

I. THE CHARACTER OF THE "OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS" IN EZRA

Imbedded in the book of Ezra are what purport to be copies of a number of royal and other official communications relating to the Jews, dating from the Persian period. These are: (1) The decree of Cyrus; or more exactly, that part of the decree which announces the purpose of Yahwè, and encourages the Jews to return from Babylonia to Jerusalem; Ezr. 1:2-4. (2) The letter of Rehum and Shimshai to Artaxerxes Longimanus, urging him to stop the building of Jerusalem; 4:8-16. (3) The reply of the king, commanding that building operations be stopped; 4:17-22. (4) A letter from Palestinian officials to Darius Nothus,<sup>1</sup> complaining that the Jews are rebuilding their temple, and at the same time giving the king a concise history (quoted verbatim from the Jews themselves) of that most interesting building; 5:7-17. (5) The decree of Cyrus<sup>2</sup> in regard to the

<sup>1</sup>This means to say only, that according to the narrative which contains these letters the king by whose order the temple was completed was Darius II. See this *Journal*, XXIII, 178 f. I have never doubted that the "Darius" of Haggai and Zechariah was really Darius I.

<sup>2</sup>It is quite possible that the document is not complete in its present form. There is obviously a gap between verses 5 and 6, for the leap which is here made from the decree of Cyrus into the middle (!) of a letter of Darius cannot possibly have been made in the original narrative. See further below.

building of the temple in Jerusalem and the restoring of the vessels of gold and silver; 6:3-5. (6) A part (the beginning is missing) of the letter of Darius in reply to the Palestinian officials; 6:6-12. (7) A letter of Artaxerxes Mnemon<sup>3</sup> to Ezra, officially establishing the Mosaic law and ritual in Jerusalem and Judea, recognizing the temple in Jerusalem as the one legitimate seat of the worship of the God of Israel, and appointing Ezra as the religious head of Palestine with full powers; 7:12-26.

This is certainly a very remarkable collection of documents, especially remarkable when it is borne in mind that we are otherwise almost entirely destitute of Jewish historical traditions from the Persian period. Aside from the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah, which are merely brief religious compositions, and the story of Nehemiah (which was hardly preserved as an official document, but rather as a popular narrative), we have scarcely even the semblance of historical standing ground.<sup>4</sup> We might expect that at least a list of the governors—Persian or Jewish—who were stationed in Jerusalem would have been handed down; but we have only the names Sheshbazzar, Zerubbabel, and Nehemiah. The succession of the high priests is given us only by the Chronicler, probably derived from oral tradition;<sup>5</sup> Neh. 12:10f., 22. As for the Jewish tradition with regard to the Persian Kings, it is a very significant fact that it places Darius Hystaspis (under the name "Darius the Mede") just before Cyrus, instead of after him. The comparison of Dan. 5:30; 6:1, 29; 9:1; 10:1; 11:1, with the succession of kings in Ezra: Cyrus, Xerxes, Artaxerxes, Darius, Artaxerxes, and again with the computation of the "seventy years" of the captivity

<sup>3</sup> See the note above. The Aramaic papyrus fragments recently discovered in Egypt make it extremely probable (though not absolutely certain; see below) that the "Artaxerxes" mentioned in the book of Nehemiah is Artaxerxes Longimanus; but according to the clear and consistent statements of our narrative the king who appears in Ezr. 7 ff. and Neh. is Artaxerxes II.

<sup>4</sup> The Chronicler's stories of Ezra and Nehemiah, as I have already shown, have no more historical value than his stories of David and the ark. I shall return to this subject later.

<sup>5</sup> The Chronicler's allusion to a "book of the Chronicles" in Neh. 12:23 is no more to be taken seriously than are his allusions to the sixteen other books of his imaginary library (see the list in Driver's *Introduction*). There is not the least internal evidence that he had a written source before him in compiling these lists, while they all bear, both in matter and in form, the unmistakable stamp of his handiwork. I shall return to this subject later.

(48 years, remainder of Neo-Babylonian rule; +21 years, reign of Darius as Babylonian monarch; +1 year of Cyrus)<sup>6</sup> proves this in conclusive manner, as I have already shown.<sup>7</sup> It seems quite certain, in view of all this, that no extensive written traditions of the Persian period were preserved in Jerusalem. The latter half of the period, in particular, was a time full of events of great interest and importance for the history of the province of Judea and of the temple at Jerusalem; but no Jewish record of them has survived. Even such a momentous thing as the Samaritan schism is without mention in old Hebrew literature, excepting the (necessarily veiled) allusion by the Chronicler in Neh. 13:28 f.<sup>8</sup> The question of the trustworthiness of these documents in the book of Ezra is therefore one of very great importance.

### 1. The Prevailing View

Most writers on the Old Testament, in modern times, have regarded the Aramaic documents in Ezra—i. e., all of those mentioned above, with the exception of the edict of Cyrus in chap. 1—as genuine, or at least, as genuine in their original form. A few scholars, to be sure, expressed themselves decidedly against the authenticity of one or more of these writings, two or three decades ago; thus Graetz, *Gesch. der Juden*, II, 1875, pp. 87, 100, 128, declared them all forgeries; and Nöldeke, *Gött. gel. Anzeigen*, 1884, 1014, rendered a similar verdict in the case of the letter in Ezr. 7:12–26. In the years which followed it became customary, among the more “advanced” Old Testament scholars, to speak of these letters and decrees as more or less altered from their primitive wording, and therefore not fully trustworthy. Thus, the first editions of Cornill’s *Einleitung* treat the Aramaic documents in Ezr.,

<sup>6</sup> See this *Journal*, XXIII, 178 f.; XXIV, 29.

<sup>7</sup> In all probability, the Jewish tradition was not far wrong in its estimate of the length of the reign of this Darius. When he took the throne of Babylonia he was “about sixty-two years of age” (Dan. 6:1), and the theory of course supposed a previous reign over Media. In reality, the reign of Darius Hystaspis lasted 36 years; which would agree excellently with the Jewish estimate. Further evidence that this “Mede” was none other than Darius Hystaspis is furnished by Dan. 6:2 f., where this king is said to have reorganized the government of the empire, dividing it into satrapies, and providing for the royal supervision of these. Here is certainly a surviving tradition of the great reforms of Darius I, who did, indeed, accomplish this very work, soon after his accession to the throne.

<sup>8</sup> *Composition of Ezr.-Neh.*, p. 48.

chaps. 4-6 as authentic, but say that 7:12-26 is "überarbeitet." Similarly Bleek-Wellhausen<sup>9</sup>, Bertheau-Ryssel, *Comm.*, 1887, Kuenen, and others. Stade, *Geschichte*, thought that the letters might possibly have been composed by the author of the narrative in which they are imbedded, though he believed the information which they contain to be in the main trustworthy. In general, it has been a well-nigh universal custom to treat "the Aramaic source" or "the Aramaic history" as an important historical composition, even among those who look with suspicion on the documents which it contains. Thus Driver, *Introduction*: "[The Aramaic source] appears to have been a thoroughly trustworthy document, though the edicts contained in it, so far as their *form* is concerned, are open to the suspicion of having been coloured by their transmission through Jewish hands." In a word: "The documents are not genuine, but in substance are thoroughly trustworthy!" Van Hoonacker, 1892, maintained the authenticity of all these "records;" and so, doubtless, did the majority of his contemporaries who had studied the matter.

Kosters, in his *Herstel*, 1893, while finding genuine portions in the Aramaic documents, rejected the most as a worthless fabrication.<sup>10</sup> Wellhausen, *Rückkehr der Juden*, 1895, declared all the Aramaic "Urkunden" worthless—but continued, and still continues, to use them for his *History*. In my own investigations, which were completed before I had seen the work of either Kosters or Wellhausen, I reached the conclusion that these Aramaic portions of Ezra are compositions exactly on a par with Dan., chaps. 1-6 and the book of Esther; and also, that the Artaxerxes letter in Ezra, chap. 7, is the work of the Chronicler alone. See my *Composition*, 1896. Professor H. P. Smith adopted nearly all my conclusions, incorporating them in his *Old Testament History*, 1903. In one point, however, his view differs widely from my own. In common

<sup>9</sup>The objections to this position are both obvious and decisive. In the first place, the "Aramaic source" contains *nothing but* these suspicious documents, and we have no right at all (in the absence of proof) to assume that it ever did contain more. And in the second place, when documents lie before us which in form do not appear to be authentic, whose statements we cannot control from any other source, and of whose author or authors we know nothing, beyond the fact that they obviously write with a "tendency," we cannot legitimately make use of them.

<sup>10</sup>Kosters' methods, however, were not thoroughly scientific, and his conclusions, in the main, were of little value.

with nearly all those who have discussed the book of Ezra in recent times, he assumes that the letters in 4:7-23 *are out of place in their present connection*, and belong rather to a time shortly before the work of Nehemiah (pp. 347 f.). This matter will be considered below. Smith seems to suggest, moreover, that our present book of Ezra could be improved not only by the excision of 4:7-24, but also by cutting out the whole group of documents (in chaps. 5 and 6) which purport to come from the time of Darius; a proceeding which would have the effect of reducing the whole "Aramaic Source" to three verses of narrative (5:1, 2; 6:15) *plus* the two letters (chap. 4) which according to his view are quite isolated, since he believes that a context for them can only be conjectured.<sup>11</sup> This certainly hacks the Gordian knot into bits.

The view prevailing among the most advanced scholars, then, for some time past, has been that these Aramaic documents are very valuable, though many have believed them to have been more or less altered from their original form by Jewish editors. Recently, however, the view has gained wide acceptance, especially in Germany, that we have here true copies of the original records themselves, the *ipsissima verba* of Persian "Urkunden und Aktenstücke." Thus Cornill, *Einleitung*<sup>5</sup>, 1905, after designating the writings by the words just quoted, says that their "Echtheit" is "über jeden Zweifel erhoben;" and similarly, that the genuineness of the Artaxerxes letter to Ezra, in 7:12-26, is now "abschliessend bewiesen." Siegfried, *Kommentar*, declares the authenticity of these Aramaic transcripts to be "unwiderleglich nachgewiesen" (p. 7). So also Bertholet, *Commentar*; Guthe, *Polychrome Bible*; Budde, *Gesch. der althebr. Litteratur*, 1906, pp. 231 ff., and many others.

This increased confidence in the "genuineness" of the Ezra documents is due chiefly to E. Meyer's *Entstehung des Judenthums* (1896), in which, after setting forth quite fully—but super-

<sup>11</sup>He remarks (p. 351): "It is clear that if the whole account were stricken out we should have a perfectly good connection, 5:2 being continued directly by 6:15." But by this reasoning we could eliminate nearly every formal document that was ever incorporated in a history. Of course, when the main narrative is resumed the connection is resumed! It is this same illogical argument that Wellhausen uses in regard to I Macc., chaps. 8 and 15, in order to get rid of the episodes and documents which he finds inconvenient.

ficially, as will appear—the arguments pro and con, the author reaches the conclusion that all the letters and edicts in the book, excepting only the Decree of Cyrus in chap. 1,<sup>12</sup> are authentic. Meyer's own opinion as to the fruit of his argument is expressed on p. 70: "Damit wäre, denke ich, nicht nur die Aechtheit der im Buche Ezra überlieferten aramäischen Dokumente gegen alle Einwände erwiesen, sondern mehrfach auch ein klarer Einblick in die Bedeutung dieser für die jüdische wie für die persische Geschichte unschätzbaren Urkunden gewonnen." To this claim the most of those Old Testament scholars who have written on the book of Ezra during the past decade have seemed to give assent.

But I do not believe that any thorough and unbiased student of the Old Testament who subjects Meyer's argument to a really critical examination, taking into account the important factors which he has left out of account, will be able to accept his conclusions.

## 2. *A Literary Habit of Ancient Narrators*

Some of the principles and general truths uttered by Meyer at the outset are of very doubtful value. At the foot of p. 2, in

<sup>12</sup> Why he should except this as he does (*Entstehung*, p. 49) is not at all clear. Every single phrase in it is cut out of the very same cloth as is the phraseology of the documents which follow. It does not contain a sentence or an idea which is not exactly paralleled in chaps. 6 and 7, saving only that at the beginning Cyrus compliments the God of the Jews by identifying him with the chief of his own gods. But this last-mentioned fact would be only a matter of course to Professor Meyer, as may be seen from his own words (p. 64): "Seit wir wissen, wie Kambyses und Darius in den ägyptischen Inschriften als treue Diener der einheimischen Götter auftreten, wie Kyros in seiner Proklamation an die Babylonier sich als den eifrigsten Verehrer und den erklärten Liebling des Marduk einführt, dürfte niemand daran Anstoss nehmen, wenn sich ein Perserkönig den Juden gegenüber in gleicher Weise ausserte." Nor is this all. Meyer explains the out and out priestly-Jewish language of the Artaxerxes edict in chap. 7 by the very "simple" theory that Ezra and his companions drew up the document, while the Persian ministers only gave it official form (p. 65). Why, then, may it not be that Sheshbazzar, or the high priest Jeshua, drew up the Cyrus edict? The reason for denying the authenticity cannot lie in the manner in which the document is presented here, for the claim of its verbal genuineness is precisely as clear as in the case of the *firman* of Ezra; the proclamation is distinctly said to have been "*in writing, as follows*" (1:2). Nor can Meyer fairly withhold credence from the Cyrus edict on the ground that it is presented to us by the Chronicler; so is the Artaxerxes decree (every word of 7:1-11 composed by the Chronicler, as Meyer himself agrees), and so also are the letters in chap. 4. It cannot be said that 1:2-4 is in any way incongruous with 6:3-5; on the contrary, if we should suppose that 1:4 was originally followed immediately by 6:3aβ ("As for the house of God in Jerusalem," etc.) so that the text of the complete edict included 1:2-4; 6:3aβ-5, the whole document would be perfectly harmonious and homogeneous. Why should not Meyer assume that the Chronicler translated the first sentences of the decree, from Aramaic into Hebrew, and transferred them to their present place in chap. 1, the place where they are really most effective? There is no difficulty whatever in the way—excepting the same difficulties which stand in the way of all the other documents.

the Introduction, he says, alluding to a remark of Stade's to the effect that the Jewish writer might himself have composed the letters and decrees which he incorporated: "Die 'bekannten Gewohnheiten alter Schriftsteller,' welche dafür sprechen sollen, dass diese Urkunden Erfindungen des Schriftstellers seien, sind mir gänzlich unbekannt. Die Alten haben den Wortlaut wichtiger Urkunden in ihre Texte genau ebenso aufgenommen wie die neueren Historiker." If this last sentence means to say, that some ancient narrators introduced some genuine documents into their narratives, it is superfluous information; if it means that the formal documents included in ancient Jewish narratives and histories are usually genuine, it is not true. And it *is* true—as will presently appear—that some of the best early (including Jewish) historians of whom we have knowledge invented "official documents," with purely literary purpose, in a way that would not be tolerated in a serious historical work of the present day. The substitution of "Historiker" for "Schriftsteller" looks a little like begging the question, moreover, since not every writer of stories—even stories which contain correct and perhaps valuable historical data—deserves the title "historian." We should hardly give this name, for instance, to the authors of Daniel, Esther, and III Maccabees. One of the things which we especially wish to find out is, whether the writer of these few pages of Aramaic embodying the records in question is entitled to it.

As for the claim that the verbal quotation of the documents is presumptive proof of their genuineness: the real fact is, that the direct citation of speeches, letters, and decrees, as a mere literary device, in order to make the account more interesting and effective by increasing its verisimilitude, plays as important a part in the narrative literature of the Hebrews as in that of other peoples. To illustrate: In II Kings 5:6 and 10:2 f. two brief letters are quoted, with the purpose of enlivening the narrative. The one is a letter from the king of Syria to the prophet Elisha, and the other a circular missive sent by Jehu to the magnates of Jezreel and Samaria. They are mere scraps; but the purpose of presenting them as verbal citations, and not as quotations in substance only, is made evident by the formal ܐܝܬܐ (the equivalent



of the Aramaic (וּכְעֵת) "To proceed," used to introduce the letter proper, after the preliminaries. In II Chron. 2:2-15 we have the transcript of two letters, the correspondence of the kings Hiram and Solomon, with which the Chronicler has enriched the story of the building of the temple. No one well acquainted with the Old Testament would think of asking how it happens that these documents, lost to sight for many centuries, should turn up at last in the hands of the Chronicler.

The "documents" thus far mentioned are not given in full official dress, with the introductory formula of address and greeting, obviously because they are too short to make this desirable. In the book of Esther—at least in its massoretic form—the several royal letters and edicts are given only in brief abstract, though the writer plainly means to give the impression that he could present them *in extenso* if he wished. And in the Greek form of the book they are indeed given verbatim and in full, with date, superscription, and all, in the same way as in the book of Ezra. In Daniel, again, we find the same literary-traditional use of "official records" in order to give dramatic life to the narrative. The technical framework of the documents is given now partially, now entirely. Thus, in 6:26 ff. we have the text of a decree of Darius. It does not begin with the king's name, because that had just been written, and the repetition would have been awkward; but its dress is otherwise quite formal: "To all the Peoples, Nations, and Languages, that dwell in all the earth; your peace be multiplied. I make a decree, etc." And in 3:31—4:34 is given, with all circumstance and in what purports to be the exact form,<sup>13</sup> a long proclamation of Nebuchadnezzar, with both introduction and formal conclusion. Other examples of the same kind are the two letters of Ptolemy Philopator "preserved" in III Maccabees; the first (3:12-29) commanding the punishment of the Jews, and the second (7:1-9) proclaiming the king their friend and protector. Both of these are in the regular epistolary form, like the letters in Ezra.

<sup>13</sup> Save that in 4:16, 25-30 the narrator carelessly lapses into the use of the third person instead of the first, in speaking of the king; precisely as the Chronicler, in composing the "personal memoirs" of Ezra, every now and then falls out of the impersonation, writing about his hero instead of letting him speak.

More instructive still, if possible, is the employment—i. e., the free composition—of these pseudo-official sources by two of the best-known Jewish historians. Josephus, in his *Antiquities*, illustrates his story of the Jews by the addition of a good many official documents, a considerable proportion of which were evidently composed by him for the purpose. Characteristic specimens are to be found in this very portion of the history dealing with the Persian period, where, in addition to the documents contained in the book of Ezra<sup>14</sup> he presents us with a letter from Cyrus to the governors in Palestine (xi, 1, 3) as well as a letter from Darius to the Samaritans (xi, 4, 9).<sup>15</sup> In both cases it is evident that what Josephus aims to contribute is not information, but pomp and circumstance. He did not compose the letters for the sake of any new material which they contain (the Cyrus letter, for instance, is made up almost entirely of things which stand elsewhere in the book), but simply for the glory which they give the Jews, in the eyes of the world and in triumph over their adversaries the Samaritans. And in the subsequent chapters of his history he proceeds in the same way, introducing here and there high-sounding documents which are quoted verbatim, and the value of which, *to us*, is very small indeed.

In I Maccabees, that most admirable of all Jewish narratives, we have the same thing once more. Its author is a man of the best stamp, and with the instincts of a true historian, though writing from a point of view which is emphatically that of his own day and his own people. He is well informed, but modest and reserved, and withal a man of few words; not at all the one to make a display of learning, or wilfully to mislead his readers. Scattered through his history are copies of official letters, treaties and proclamations; formally faultless, as a rule, but often betraying, in one way or another, the fact that they are not "genuine."<sup>16</sup>

<sup>14</sup> In the interpolated form which I have already described at some length. See this *Journal*, XXIII, 136 ff.

<sup>15</sup> If anyone wishes to suppose, with Hölcher, *Quellen des Josephus*, 43 ff., that these "apocryphal" additions, and numerous others of the same sort in the subsequent chapters of the history, were made not by Josephus himself, but by one of his sources, whose aim, as he says, was to "glorify Judaism," the argument is of course not affected by the supposition.

<sup>16</sup> So scholars have long recognized and repeatedly shown, in the case of one or another of these documents; for example, the letter of Demetrius Soter, 10:25-45; the proclamation

They are doubtless in the main *trustworthy* in the sense that they give a correct impression of the progress of events, inasmuch as they embody the honest and sober recollection of one who was exceptionally well informed, and who wrote soon after the events, of which at least the greater part had taken place during his own life-time. But whoever looks here for a habit of incorporating official records similar to the habit of modern historians will look in vain.

Again, the fondness of these early writers for the dramatic form of presentation must not be overlooked in this connection. With this end in view they frequently quote verbatim the speeches, prayers, or other utterances of their chief characters. Judas Maccabaeus makes a succession of fiery speeches to his soldiers, I Macc. 3:18-22, 58-60; 4:8-11, etc. Are they "genuine"? So Josephus very often improves the Old Testament narrative by making similar insertions. Thus, in telling the story of Nehemiah (*Antt.*, xi, 5, 7) he gives us the wording of an address of some length made by that hero in the temple. Greek historians had the same habit, as every one knows. Thucydides, for instance, in iv, 85-87 (to take the example which lies nearest at hand) quotes in full a very interesting speech made by the Spartan general Brasidas to the men of Acanthus. The oration is full of weighty matters, and it had an immediate and important effect, as we are expressly told, for it induced the Acanthians to revolt from Athens (just as the letter of Rehum and Shimshai in Ezra 4 had the immediate and important effect of stopping the building of the temple in Jerusalem). Fortunately, Thucydides himself has told us what to expect from such "quotations" as this one. His words are worth repeating here because of their bearing on the present

in honor of Simon, 14:27-47; and the Roman edict, 15:16-21. Probably not a single one of all the writings thus incorporated in the history represents in its wording, nor even exactly in its substance, any actual document. For the statements made, and the opinions expressed here, I may refer to my article "I Maccabees" in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, III, 2857-69. A renewed study of the book since that article was written, has confirmed me in the conclusions there stated and supported. Certainly the most, and perhaps all, of these incorporated writings were freely composed by the author of the history, as the best means of narrating what he wished to narrate and of making the impression which he wished to make. He had before him no written narrative source or sources. There is no valid reason whatever for supposing interpolation, anywhere in the book. The last three chapters (or more exactly, 14:16-16:24), now quite generally regarded as secondary, certainly formed a part of the original work.

inquiry; i, 22 (Jowett's translation): "*I have put into the mouth of each speaker the sentiments proper to the occasion, expressed as I thought he would be likely to express them; while at the same time I endeavored, as nearly as I could, to give the general purport of what was actually said.*"<sup>17</sup> That is, he gives us in each case, not words which were uttered, but words which, judging from all known facts, ought to have been uttered. This, I take it, is *not* the method of a modern historian, but more nearly that of the writer of a thoroughgoing historical novel. As for drawing a line of distinction, as regards this free use, between the spoken oration, which presumably *was not* preserved in writing, and the official document, which presumably *was* preserved somewhere, we may be sure that no one of these ancient writers did anything of the kind. Not even Thucydides (to say nothing of the Jewish narrators!) could ever have supposed that it was any less permissible to compose the utterances of a Brasidas in the form of a letter, beginning: "Brasidas to the men of Acanthus, greeting," etc. (supposing that a letter was known, or believed, to have been written), than to give the same things in the form of a speech, with the orator's introduction: "Men of Acanthus!" when that was believed to have been the form of the communication. To illustrate: in i, 137 Thucydides presents us with what purports to be a true copy of a letter from Themistocles to Artaxerxes I Longimanus. As a matter of fact, it was certainly invented by

<sup>17</sup> These words, I believe, describe exactly the proceeding of the author of I Maccabees in composing the documents which are scattered through his history. If original documents were ready to hand, he was glad to use them; if they were not, he invented them, like Thucydides, to the best of his ability and in perfect good faith.

I have recently had the satisfaction of seeing my estimate of the account of the Jewish embassy to Rome, told in I Macc., chap. 8, strikingly confirmed. In my article in the *Encycl. Bibl.*, mentioned above, I argued that the narrative of the sending of the embassy, and of its favorable reception, is accurate, and was plainly written by a contemporary who was well informed; but that the *treaty* there quoted (vss. 23-32) was invented by the author of the book in accordance with the custom which his contemporary readers, at all events, understood (*loc. cit.*, col. 2866). Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 268, contends that I Macc. 8 is an interpolation, though he gives no good reason for this view, beyond the fact that the quoted document cannot be "genuine," and that the narrative is therefore to be suspected. Now, however, Niese has shown (*Nöldeke-Festschrift*, II, 817-29) that Jos., *Antt.*, xiv, 233 has preserved a genuine Roman document of the year 161/160 B. C., dealing with this embassy and containing mention of the reply made to the Jews by the Roman Senate. The substantial accuracy of the narrative in chap. 8 is thus proved once for all; as for the treaty, Niese recognizes, as I had, that it is merely "ein freies, schriftstellerisches Produkt." I have no doubt that the case of I Macc. 15:15-24 is exactly similar, as I also argued at length (col. 2865). Here, again, Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p. 276, supposes an interpolation.

the historian, according to the principles above stated by him in regard to the speeches, as few modern scholars would doubt.<sup>18</sup> But to speak of this, and of the documents in Josephus, and Daniel, and I Maccabees, and the rest, as "forgeries" would be a ridiculous misuse of terms.<sup>19</sup> On the other hand, no such freedom as this could be tolerated at the present day, in a serious historical work.

To sum up: The Hebrew and Jewish narrators and historians, of all ages, were accustomed to give life to their narratives by inventing and inserting speeches, prayers, letters, royal decrees, treaties, and the like, occasionally summarized, but more often given "verbally" and in full, including even the stereotyped framework; just as is done by modern writers of historical novels. Out of the considerable number of such formal documents which have reached us in early Jewish literature (leaving now out of account the documents in Ezra) very few can be called genuine, at best,<sup>20</sup> and these few belong to a time long after the close of the Persian period. In the case of the most of them it seems highly probable that the author and his readers thought of them merely as a mode of literary embellishment. They are not, and were not intended, to be taken seriously. This certainly gives us a clear presumption with which to approach the Ezra documents, though not exactly the presumption which Professor Meyer demands.

But Meyer's failure to take account of this literary habit is by no means the chief objection which is to be raised against his treatment of the Ezra documents, as I shall endeavor to show.

### 3. *The Tendency of the Documents*

In a footnote on p. 43 of his *Entstehung* Meyer says: "Davon will ich gar nicht weiter reden, dass absolut nicht einzusehen ist, zu

<sup>18</sup> "Der Brief Thuc. 1, 137 kann nicht als echte Urkunde angesehen werden;" Nöldeke, *Aufsätze zur persischen Geschichte*, p. 50, note.

<sup>19</sup> See my *Composition of Ezra-Nehemiah*, p. 29, above; and my article "I Maccabees" in the *Encycl. Bibl.*, §§ 8 (end), 9d, 10. It would be interesting and profitable to carry still farther the discussion of this whole matter of the literary embellishment of serious narrative by ancient writers. It is a subject which, so far as Hebrew-Jewish literature is concerned, has been almost totally neglected.

<sup>20</sup> Josephus incorporates some genuine documents in his history, in the portion dealing with the close of the Greek rule and the beginning of the Roman period. He simply copies them from his Greek sources, and sometimes inserts them in ludicrously unsuitable places; see Niese in the *Nöldeke-Festschrift*, II, 828, and Hölcher, *Quellen des Josephus*, p. 22.

welchem Zwecke sich jemand die Mühe gegeben haben sollte, diese und ebenso die anderen Urkunden von cap. 4-6 zu fabriciren." This confession of inability to see any motive for composing these documents is a fatal one, for it shows either that Meyer has not the thoroughgoing acquaintance with Jewish literature which is absolutely necessary to any one who undertakes such an investigation as this, or else, that he is shutting his eyes to what lies in plain sight. In the first place, we are not limited to imaginary cases, for we have in the pre-Christian Jewish writings plenty of "fabricated" documents of just this nature, to which we can turn for instruction. Why did the Chronicler—or his source—insert the Hiram-Solomon letters (verbally quoted) in his account of the building of the temple? Why do we find in Josephus' history of the Persian period the formal letters from Cyrus to the Syrian governors and from Darius to the Samaritans, to say nothing of the many others of the same character? And again, why should the author of the Daniel stories "have given himself the trouble" to compose the royal edicts which he incorporates, especially the very long decree of Nebuchadnezzar? Can any one imagine a reason why the long and elaborate "Letter of Aristeas" should have been composed with such painstaking by an Egyptian Jew, in the third century B. C.? At all events, it was thus fabricated, and probably at very near the time when these Ezra documents were composed. And then we have the dozens of royal letters and decrees, freely invented, in the three books of Maccabees, in Esther, and still elsewhere. Even if the motives were "absolut nicht einzusehen," the fact would remain that these more or less elaborate formal instruments were created by the wholesale, by Jewish narrators, from at least the third century B. C. onward.

It is plain, further, that Meyer greatly underestimates the power of imagination possessed by the early Jewish writers, and the extent to which this power was used in their writings. On p. 47, for example, in speaking of the statement in Ezr. 6:1, 2 that the memorandum supposed to be in Babylon<sup>21</sup> was found at Ecbatana, he says that this is "was kein Mensch erfunden haben würde."

<sup>21</sup> As a matter of fact, however, the word **בבל** here does not mean "Babylon," but 'Babylonia.'

But this is putting an astonishingly low estimate on the capacity of an Israelite story-teller. Such bits of real life as this are just the business of any one who wishes to give his narrative touches of verisimilitude. Moreover, in this particular instance even a very stupid narrator might well have been equal to the invention, for it was obviously incumbent on him to show why this document had been lost to sight: the fact is (so the narrator implies), no one would have thought of looking for such a record anywhere else than in Babylonia; but really it was in Ecbatana all the time; hence Xerxes, Artaxerxes, and Darius had known nothing about it. And so it is with the other elements of the narrative, or features of the documents, which Meyer singles out as marks of genuineness; they are all such, and only such, as any writer with a particle of imagination would be sure to produce.

Again, Meyer points repeatedly to the plausible elements in these records, as though giving conclusive proof of their genuineness; a "forger" would not have made them thus. So on p. 43, for instance, speaking of the letter of Tattenai in chap. 5, he says that if all this is forged, the forgery is "äusserst geschickt gemacht." But does not this also reveal a surprisingly low opinion of the literary ability of that day? The authorship of these documents might be called "skilful" if they were drawn up and worded in such a way that they would not appear to be Jewish compositions. But any student of the Old Testament can see that they all sound distinctly—often, indeed, quite unmistakably—like Jewish compositions. Even Meyer sees it. He is obliged to admit a "Jewish redaction" of the official writings in chap. 6 (see below). He is even forced to assume, in the case of 7:12–26, that Ezra composed this royal edict, while the Persians merely signed it! Whatever else may be said of the narrator whose "Persian official documents" necessitate such a telltale hypothesis as this, he certainly cannot be called "äusserst geschickt."

As for the skill displayed (it may be remarked here in passing), we might reasonably have expected that the composer, or composers, of these documents would try to imitate the Aramaic of the fifth century B. C. That which is actually employed belongs to a period two or three centuries later, as will be shown presently.

It may be, however, that specimens of the older language were not within reach.

But to return to the tendency of the documents. Meyer's remark, quoted above, that he cannot imagine a motive for the invention of these records, is by no means an empty phrase. It is plain, on page after page, that he is indeed able to overlook the many plain indications which any thorough student of Hebrew-Jewish history and literature finds staring him in the face; I mean those students who recognize the fact that the Chronicler did not write unvarnished history, and that the narrative of Daniel is fancifully didactic rather than literally accurate. It is quite evident, as one reads on, that this whole laborious investigation of the "Entstehung" would not have been written if its author had been more intimately acquainted with the people about which he is writing.<sup>22</sup> It is not only easy to see the "Tendenz" which produced these documents; it is impossible not to see it, for one who is familiar with the literature which is most nearly related. On p. 51 Meyer concedes that 6:12*a* cannot be the genuine utterance of a Persian king, and accordingly decides that a "jüdischer Eiferer" inserted it in the original document. But may not such an "Eiferer" have written more than single verses? The Chronicler composed the Cyrus edict in chap. 1, and doubtless with a motive. May not a similar motive have led some one of his fellows to compose other edicts?

During the Greek period, the Jewish religion found itself on trial for its life. The children of Israel now saw, as never before, how small and despised a part of humanity they were. Greek thought and culture, especially, had made great inroads. The Dispersion, which had assumed great proportions even in the Persian period,<sup>23</sup> now threatened to put a speedy end to the national existence. To crown all, the glory of Jerusalem, so long the center

<sup>22</sup> Professor Meyer takes his predecessors to task (pp. 4 f., 70 f.) for their too exclusive attention to Palestine and the Old Testament, to the neglect of Persian history especially. It is true that the tendency to take the narrow view is strong; and Old Testament scholars may well feel grateful to Meyer for the many new points of view which he has given, as well as for his vigorous and clear presentation of his side of the argument. But the prime requisite, after all, is knowledge of the Jews.

<sup>23</sup> So I wrote in one of my lectures on the Second Isaiah, delivered at Harvard University in 1905. Meyer, p. 67: "Eine jüdische Diaspora gab es damals noch nicht." The matter is of course of the most vital importance to any theory of the "restoration."



and heart of the Jewish religion, began to be dimmed. There was a temple (as we now know) in Egypt; another, more recently established, on Mount Gerizim; and very likely still others in Babylonia and elsewhere. It is no wonder that the zealous Jews of Jerusalem did what they could to stem the tide, and to establish beyond all question the supremacy of the mother church. It was this impulse, primarily, which produced the whole "history" which the Chronicler wrote, and which gave the motive for composing these Persian documents and many others of the same kind. They are an eminently characteristic product of the Greek period.

I can think of no better way of setting forth the "tendency" of these documents than to quote one or two recent characterizations of similar writings belonging to this same period. Schürer, *Geschichte*<sup>3</sup>, III, 468, speaking of the Letter of Aristeas, says: "Diese Inhaltsübersicht zeigt, dass der Zweck der Erzählung keineswegs die erzählte Geschichte an sich ist, sondern diese Geschichte, insofern sie lehrt, welche Hochachtung und Bewunderung für das jüdische Gesetz und das Judentum überhaupt selbst heidnische Autoritäten wie der König Ptolemäus und sein Gesandter Aristeas hegten. Denn gerade darin gipfelt die Tendenz des Ganzen, dass hier dem jüdischen Gesetze aus heidnischem Munde ein Lob zubereitet wird." Here is a motive, and a very easily comprehensible one, which could have produced just such official utterances as those which we find in the book of Ezra. Very similar are the terms in which Hölcher, *Quellen des Josephus*, p. 44, describes a considerable group of "official" documents and allied narratives dealing with the Persian and Greek periods, which he believes Josephus to have derived from Alexander Polyhistor: "All diesen Geschichten gemeinsam ist . . . die ausgesprochene Tendenz, das Judentum zu verherrlichen: es soll illustriert werden, wie die Könige der Weltreiche dem Judentum huldigen, wie sie für Tempel und Kultur Sorge tragen, wie sie in Jerusalem anbeten, wie sie offiziell dort für sich beten lassen. Sie betragen sich als musterhafte Proselyten; sie beschenken den Tempel, sie gewähren den Juden Privilegien und Steuererlasse. Gerade dies letztere kehrt immer wieder; darum auch all die

Edikte, die für diese Quelle charakteristisch sind. Das andere, was die Legenden mit Vorliebe behandeln, ist das Verhältnis von Juden und Samaritanern. Die Juden erscheinen dabei stets als Muster der Frömmigkeit und Treue, die Samaritaner aber als heuchlerisch und boshaft; die letzteren ziehen denn auch stets, wie die Quelle zeigt, den kürzeren."

No better characterization of the Aramaic documents in Ezra is needed than these two quotations furnish. Almost every single one of the features here enumerated is to be found in the Old Testament book; and what is more, there is no material in any of the Ezra documents which does not directly serve one or more of the purposes here named. The exaltation of the Jews and their religion by foreign kings and magnates; *the triumph over the Samaritans*; the oft-repeated and emphasized proof that Jerusalem is the one legitimate seat of the cultus; the claim of especial perquisites and privileges for the clergy in particular; these all are not present incidentally in the documents, *they are all that the documents contain*. To go into detail here would involve writing out pretty much the whole of their contents. The strong Jewish coloring is everywhere (even in the unnecessary laudation of the Jews by their enemies, 4:20; 5:11 f.), and permeates the whole fabric; the worn-out subterfuge of an "Uebersetzung" will not avail here.

But the Jewish character of these documents is not the only count in the indictment. Against their genuineness is also to be put down, that they show no sign of intimate acquaintance with the history of the Persian period. The Jewish apologist, writing in the Greek period, found himself confronted with two principal questions which he must needs answer, and answer conclusively. They were the following: (1) How did it happen that (as known from Haggai and Zechariah) the temple at Jerusalem was not suitably built and completed until the time of Darius? and (2) If Jerusalem and Judea were completely depopulated by the Chaldeans (as is asserted in II Kings 24:14; 25:26 (!), etc.), what manner of men were the Jews of the second temple? Whence did they come? Were they a mixed rabble from the surrounding districts? *Might not even the Samaritans be of better Jewish*

*blood, after all, as they claimed to be?* We have before us, in the Chronicler's history, an answer to these two questions; an answer which began with Adam and was worked out with minute elaboration down into the latter part of the Persian period. The Aramaic documents (by whomsoever composed) are obviously an important part of the same answer;<sup>24</sup> and it is equally obvious that every particle of the material which they contain could have been derived either directly or indirectly from Haggai, Zechariah, and II Kings 25, with the aid of such information as to Persian things as could be had in any city of Syria or Palestine at any time in the Greek period.<sup>25</sup> If anyone asserts that these documents in Ezra display more knowledge of the Persian court, or of conditions in the Persian realm, than is displayed in the books of Daniel, Esther, and Tobit, he asserts what is not true.

An important conclusion stated by Meyer, p. 74, deserves to be especially emphasized: "Diese Thatsache . . . lehrt, dass es über das ganze erste Jahrhundert der nachexilischen Geschichte bis auf Ezra und Nehemia herab keinerlei Nachrichten und keinerlei Tradition gab mit Ausnahme dessen, was in den erhaltenen Urkunden Ezra 4-6 und in den gleichzeitigen Propheten stand." That is, aside from these same more than suspicious "Urkunden," there is nothing whatever to show that any genuine tradition of the early Persian period was preserved in Jerusalem. Even this support is denied them.<sup>26</sup>

Once more. There are numerous perfectly plain bits of evidence showing that the documents, in the form which we have,

<sup>24</sup> See further below.

<sup>25</sup> It is obvious why the "return" was represented as taking place under Cyrus, and also, why Cyrus should have been supposed to furnish money for the building of the temple. This was the beginning of the new (Persian) *régime*, under which the temple was actually built and completed; the natural turning-point was here. And as for the royal aid, how else could these returning exiles, entering a desolate land and a ruined city, have undertaken their task? Such reflections as these first resulted in definite theories at about the middle of the third century B. C., so far as our sources enable us to judge. Compare what was said above, in regard to the Greek period.

<sup>26</sup> So far as the "Urkunde" 7:12-26 is concerned, it is of course customary to find support for it in the "Ezra memoirs" which immediately follow. As a matter of fact, the one is precisely as "genuine" as the other. As I have already demonstrated, the whole Ezra story was composed by the Chronicler, with no other apparent basis than his own imagination (my *Composition*, pp. 14-29, 57-62). Meyer treats these Chronicler tales, and some of the worthless lists as well, as trustworthy material; with the result that the most of his book is simply built on air. Wellhausen's *Geschichte*, in the chapters dealing with this period, is not much better.

are not what they profess to be. These are (briefly): (1) The wording. Aside from the specifically Jewish phrases, and the peculiar vocabulary of the Chronicler, the comparison of 6:5 with 5:14 (!) shows conclusively that we are dealing, at least at this single but crucial point, with made-up documents. (2) The language. As will be shown below, the Aramaic of Ezra is not at all that of the fifth century B. C. (3) The names of the kings. The form of the name "Artaxerxes" which is employed in Ezra is not above suspicion; and the name "Nebuchadrezzar" appears in the form (written with *n*) which is characteristic of the Greek period. (4) The documents are not dated. Genuine documents would have borne dates; and it is unlikely that any copyist or editor would ever have omitted such an extremely interesting and important detail.

The final statement of the case, then, is this. Here are documents which from their wording cannot possibly be regarded as true copies of genuine originals; written in a dialect which belongs to a time much later than the one which they profess to represent; containing no facts or materials not obtainable in the Greek period, and unsupported by any tradition from the Persian period; found in the most untrustworthy of all Hebrew histories; themselves written with a manifest tendency; and finding their only close parallels in numerous writings of about the same time which are acknowledged to be inventions—and we are asked to pronounce them 'genuine, at least in substance'! The theory of their authenticity, in any sense whatever, has evidently not a leg to stand on.

On p. 43, in speaking of the Tattenai correspondence in *Ezr.*, chap. 5, Meyer says: "Wer die Urkunde verwirft, thut dies denn auch nicht aus inneren Gründen, sondern weil er den Tempelbau unter Kyros oder richtiger den Befehl des Kyros den Tempel wieder aufzubauen für unhistorisch hielt, oder weil er die Nachricht von der Rückkehr der Juden unter Kyros verwirft." But this is hardly fair to the scholars who have written on the subject. Probably not one of the number cares a straw for his most cherished theory in comparison with finding out the truth as to the origin and character of these records. We are in the direst need

of information as to the history of the Jews in the Persian period, and every scrap of material that promises help ought to be treasured and put to use. But no extremity of need can outweigh the obligation to follow the evidence. So the verdict in regard to the Aramaic part of Ezra must be, "that it contains, not a series of remarkable utterances by heathen kings and officers to the glory of the Jews and their religion, but a kind of literature that abounds during this period of Jewish history. So far as historical value is concerned, it stands in all respects on the same plane with Dan. 2-6 and the book of Esther."<sup>27</sup>

## II. THE CHRONICLER'S PART IN THE ARAMAIC PORTIONS

The letter of Artaxerxes to Ezra, 7:12-26, was created entire by the Chronicler, like the context in which it stands. The narrative which introduces it, 7:1-11, is the work of his hand, and so also is that which follows, 7:27 f.; 8:1-36, as I have shown elsewhere (*Composition*, pp. 16 ff., 20 f.). There is no single verse in all the Chronicler's history which is more unmistakably his own property than 7:28. The letter itself is marked throughout its whole extent by his favorite ideas and phrases, and his peculiar lexical and syntactical usages, manifest even in their Aramaic dress. See the notes below, *passim*. It is especially interesting to observe how closely this letter parallels two of the Chronicler's documents which precede it; namely, the royal edict in chap. 1 and the royal letter to the "eparchs" of the Transflumen, now preserved in I Esdras 4:47b-56, but originally following immediately upon Ezra 1:1-11, as I have shown. Thus, 1:2 is reproduced in 7:14; 1:3 in 7:13 and the last clause of vs. 15 ("who dwells in Jerusalem"); 1:4 reappears in 7:15, 16 (including the "silver and gold and free-will offerings," offered "for the house of God which is in Jerusalem"). And again: 7:17 had its counterpart in I Esdr. 4:52 (and also in Ezr. 6:5, *nota bene*); 7:18 corresponds to 4:54 ff.; vs. 19 brings back again Ezr. 1:7 f.; vs. 20 corresponds to I Esdr. 4:51, and vs. 21 to vss. 47b, 48. Vss. 22 f. are again similar to I Esdr. 4:51 f., besides reproducing very noticeably Ezr. 6:9 f. And finally,

<sup>27</sup> *Composition*, p. 8.

vs. 24 is a repetition of I Esdr. 4:53-56 (cf. also 49 f.), the perquisites of the priests, Levites, and gate-keepers. That is, the decrees of Cyrus in favor of Sheshbazzar and his company are here reproduced in substance, and even with a striking repetition of the wording of whole phrases, in the decree of Artaxerxes for Ezra and his followers.

Another passage composed in Aramaic by the Chronicler is 6:15-18, directly continued in vss. 19 ff. by his Hebrew narrative. That vs. 15 belongs to him is proved sufficiently by the exact date which it contains, coupled with the fact that in vs. 14 the preceding narrative comes to a natural close. I was formerly inclined to assign the last three words of vs. 14 to him also (*Composition*, p. 10), but now believe that it is better to regard them as the work of a mere glossator. The Chronicler has written out the story of this whole period of history with some care, and it is hardly fair to him to accuse him, unnecessarily, of this bit of carelessness. He should at least be given the benefit of the doubt.

The work of the Chronicler's hand is to be seen, once more, in the two verses 6:9, 10, as I have already shown with abundant proof (*Composition*, p. 10).

These are the only parts of the Aramaic of Ezra which can surely be traced to the Chronicler. The question of course suggests itself, whether he may not also have been the author of 6:6-14; the grounds of the suspicion being (1) the presence of two verses written by him in the middle of this section; and (2) the strange transition from vs. 5 to vs. 6, the words of Cyrus being followed, without any warning, by those of Darius; which certainly resembles the heedless leap in chap. 7, from vs. 26 to vs. 27, where Artaxerxes is suddenly interrupted by Ezra. But it is far more probable that there has been an accidental omission between verses 5 and 6 in chap. 6. Even the Chronicler himself would hardly have made so intolerably abrupt a transition as this. Moreover, there are no manifest traces of his presence in vss. 6-8 and 11-14, though in a passage of this length, in any writing of his, it is usually easy to recognize his handiwork. It is to be observed, also, that when vss. 9 f. are removed, the passage reads

smoothly and consistently. The original narrator is concerned only with the building of the temple; there is no evidence, aside from these two verses, that he also intended to represent Cyrus and Darius as providing for the details of the cultus—to say nothing of the “bullocks, rams and lambs” and the “wheat, salt, wine and oil” which the Chronicler is so fond of parading before us; see I Chron. 29:21; II Chron. 29:21, 22, 32; Ezr. 6:17; 7:17, 22; 8:35, and cf. II Chron. 2:9, 14.

The question, which has sometimes been raised, whether the whole Aramaic section, 4:8—6:14, may not also have been written by the Chronicler, I have once more examined with care; with the result of satisfying myself completely that the hypothesis is an untenable one. The manner of the transition in 4:7 f. (in whatever way these verses are treated) shows distinctly that the work of another narrator begins here. The Chronicler, composing the narrative freely, could not possibly have proceeded in this way. It is also incredible that he could have kept his identity concealed throughout this long section. He could hardly have brought himself to leave the Levites, singers, porters, and Nethinim completely out of sight for nearly three whole chapters; and even if that had been possible, he could not have abandoned to this extent his own vocabulary and style.<sup>28</sup>

I formerly thought that the interpolation 4:9 f. might be attributed to the Chronicler, and regarded him as the probable author of 4:24; see my *Composition*, pp. 7–9. The former of these passages will be discussed below; the latter can best be considered here.

So far as internal evidence is concerned, there is no reason for regarding the Chronicler as the author of 4:24. The phrase מֶלֶךְ פֶּרֶס is found also written by another hand in 6:14, as I have just shown, and it probably was in common use. The only argument which needs to be considered is the one which aims to show that the verse is an editorial patch. The argument rests on two main assumptions: (1) that this Aramaic narrative is a contem-

<sup>28</sup> As I have remarked elsewhere, the Chronicler's peculiar habits in the use of words, phrases, and constructions appear everywhere, and in quite uniform distribution, throughout Chron.-Ezr.-Neh., *excepting* in (1) the parts copied verbally from Samuel and Kings; (2) this Aramaic source, Ezr. 4:8–6:14; (3) Nehemiah, chaps. 1, 2, 4–6.

porary account, and trustworthy history; and (2) that vs. 24, which speaks of the building of the temple, is out of keeping with the preceding documents, which speak only of the building of the city. But these two assumptions are both mistaken.

I have already shown that the order of the Persian kings, Cyrus, Xerxes, Artaxerxes I, Darius II, in these chapters, 4 ff.—and therefore, of course, the order of the chapters themselves—is the only correct one, according to the view which prevailed in Jerusalem in the Greek period. Both the substance and the progress of the narrative here are precisely what we should expect, when the purposes of the narrator are taken into account. As already remarked (above, p. 225), the author of these “official” documents and the narrative containing them was concerned with two important matters: the delay in building the temple, and the relation of the Jews to the Samaritans. These enemies of the Jews undertook, on two different occasions, to hinder the building of the sanctuary in Jerusalem, by writing to the Persian king. On the first occasion, when they were shrewd enough to speak only of the city as a whole,<sup>29</sup> without specifying the temple in particular, they had the good luck to gain their point, and the building was stopped. On the second occasion, when other officials, less cautious, wrote only in regard to the temple, the attempt not only failed, but even proved to be of great assistance to the Jews, for it resulted in the recovery of long-lost documents which led the king at once to take the temple in Jerusalem under his special patronage. From the literary point of view—and we need no other—this is all quite according to rule; in fact, it is exactly the way in which any story or play, ancient or modern, would conceive the course of events in order to make it as dramatically effective as possible. At first the villain triumphs, not by fair means, but through misrepresentation; but in the end he is overwhelmed.

This being the case, it is obvious that such a verse as 24, standing where it now stands, was essential to the original narra-

<sup>29</sup> It is customary to say that the two letters in 4:11-22 deal with the building of *the city wall*. This is not the case, however. It is *the building up of the city* that is described, and that the king orders to be stopped (vs. 21). Of course the city walls are also specified by the Samaritans; and of course the prohibition of further building included the temple, at which the Samaritans were especially aiming.



tive. The way in which it attaches itself directly to vs. 23 is evident, and also the fact that it is absolutely indispensable as the preparation for 5:1.<sup>30</sup> The composer of this Jewish-Samaritan drama could not have devised a sentence which would more exactly have satisfied his immediate purposes. The question of its authorship can therefore not fairly be raised at all.

In conclusion: I believe that the Chronicler incorporated this Aramaic writing in its entirety, and that we have it in substantially its original form. A passage has been accidentally lost between 6:5 and 6:6, as already remarked. The story probably began with some such formula as [בִּימֵי אֲרֻחֶשְׁתָּא מֶלֶכָּא כְּתָב] רְרוּם בַּעַל טַעַם, and so on as in 4:8. The Chronicler, when he wrote his own introductory verse, 4:7 (as emended below), necessarily omitted the words which I have inclosed in brackets.

There were doubtless many such popular narratives written, after the same manner in which popular and edifying tales have always been written. The one which the Chronicler chose to incorporate was the work of a man of his own school of ideas, who in all probability lived and wrote at about the same time as he, namely in the middle of the third century B. C.<sup>31</sup>

### III. THE ARAMAIC OF THE BOOK OF EZRA

On this point it is now possible to be very brief, thanks to the recent discoveries of Aramaic papyri in Egypt. All the Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra belongs to the dialect of the second and third centuries B. C. This includes (1) the Aramaic written by the Chronicler; (2) that of the Story of the Samaritan Intrigues, which he incorporates; (3) the language of Dan.,

<sup>30</sup> It is altogether unlikely that the date, "in the second year of Darius," stood also in 5:1 (as I once suggested as possible, *Comp.*, p. 12, note 1). As for I Esdr. 6:1, of course the date there had to be inserted by the redactor who interpolated the Story of the Three Youths and transposed the Artaxerxes letters. The curious theory (now quite generally adopted) that the passage 5:1, 2 was not written by the author of 5:3 ff. needs no additional refutation. Of course the one who knew (5:14) of the prophecy of Haggai and Zechariah knew also (from Hag. 1:12, 14, etc.) that Zerubbabel and Jeshua were the leaders in the work of building. Chap. 6:7 shows the same thing, plainly enough.

<sup>31</sup> It is fair to draw this conclusion from the fact that this Aramaic tale presupposes (not only in 4:12, 15 f., but also, by implication, in 5:12 ff.) the theory of a return of "the Babylonian exiles." Inasmuch as every other mention of such a return, in the whole Old Testament down to Tobit 14:5, comes from the Chronicler himself (*Composition*, pp. 62 f.), it is probable that the theory originated in his own generation, in the school to which he belonged.

chaps. 2-7.<sup>32</sup> The date at which the Chronicler wrote may properly be taken as the representative one for the period covered by all these documents. The Aramaic story which he edits may be a trifle older, though it probably belongs to his own generation.<sup>33</sup> One chapter, at least, of the Aramaic part of Daniel was written nearly a century later. From the linguistic point of view, this is all thoroughly homogeneous; there is no possibility of any scientific division into "earlier" and "later" sections. All these writings, and all in just the same way, represent a certain stage in the development of Western Aramaic; there is not a single particular, major or minor, in which the one of them can be said with confidence to belong to a more advanced stage of development than its fellow.<sup>34</sup> Any one of the group might be designated the earliest, or the latest, with equal right.

This is by no means a new discovery, so far as the identity of the Aramaic of Ezra with that of Daniel is concerned. On this point the Semitic scholars of the present generation are practically agreed. There has been a strange failure, however, to draw the correct conclusion as to the *date* represented by this stage of the dialect. We have had for comparison a good many Aramaic inscriptions dating all the way from the eighth century B. C. downward, including material sufficient to give us a tolerably clear idea

<sup>32</sup> In my own opinion, which I have often expressed, the first six chapters of Daniel are older than the rest of the book, which was written in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. But there is no difference between the Aramaic of chaps. 2-6 and that of chap. 7.

<sup>33</sup> The Aramaic Story of the Three Youths, as I have already shown, belongs approximately to this same period, but is probably older than any of these other documents, dating from near the beginning of the third century.

<sup>34</sup> The fact that the suffix forms **לכם** and **להם** (instead of **לכון** and **להון**) do not happen to be used in Dan., as they are frequently in Ezer., can hardly be made an exception to this statement, since the forms ending in **ם** continue to be found in both Jewish and gentile Aramaic until long after the time when the book of Daniel was given its final form (e. g., in the Jerusalem Targums, and in Nabatean inscriptions dated in the first century A. D.). The Chronicler uses *both* the **ם** and the **ן** suffixes, and the one about as often as the other.

Similarly, the preformative **א**, instead of **ה**, in the stems of the verb, is represented by several examples in Daniel, but does not appear in Ezra. But we seem to have the same thing in the form **אשתדדר**, Ezr. 4:15, 19, which is apparently a verbal noun from the *hithpa'al* of **שדר**; cf. **משדדר** in Dan. 6:15. Moreover, the process has already begun in the time of the papyri from Elephantine; see the *hithpe'el* form **אשתדירן** (1st pers. plur. perf.), in Cowley's K, 2. Notice also such parallel phenomena as the name **אושעיה** (for **הר**) in H, 18, and the pronoun **אנך** in Ezra.

It is very probable, indeed, that Dan., chap. 2-6 was written somewhat later than the Aramaic parts of Ezra; but it is not safe to say that this is *proved by the language*.

of some of the most characteristic changes which took place in the language, from the Euphrates to Egypt. The evidence has been quite sufficient to show that our "biblical Aramaic" could hardly be dated so early as the fourth century B. C., to say nothing of a still earlier date. Yet scholars have persisted in looking at the Ezra "documents" through the medium of a theory, and have found it possible to hold the view that the language in which they are written belongs to the sixth and fifth centuries,<sup>35</sup> while dating the Aramaic of Daniel in the second century—as though the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum* did not exist.

Now, however, the papyri of Assuan and Elephantine have given us abundant material confirming most decisively the witness of the inscriptions. The first publishers of these texts have not made the matter plain, to be sure; in fact, what they have written would rather tend to mislead inquirers in regard to this point. Sachau, *Drei aramäische Papyrusurkunden aus Elephantine*, 1907, p. 3, writes: "Die Sprache, in der sie geschrieben sind, ist in allen wesentlichen Stücken identisch mit derjenigen der aramäischen Kapitel in den Büchern Esra und Daniel, und ihre Phraseologie bietet nahe Berührungen mit derjenigen der amtlichen Urkunden im Esrabuche." And Sayce and Cowley had previously written in their publication, *Aramaic Papyri Discovered at Assuan*, 1906, p. 20: "Much of the interest of the texts lies in the many points of contact which they show with Palestinian Aramaic as represented by the books of Ezra and Daniel. *The differences are due no doubt partly to the difference of locality, partly also perhaps to the popular style of the deeds as compared with the literary style of Biblical Aramaic*" (the italics are mine). But this merely obscures the true state of the case. Of course the language of all these writings, biblical and extra-biblical, is Aramaic and (more or less) Jewish. The "points of contact" could be taken for granted; the points of difference are what we most need to consider.

<sup>35</sup> Those who think that these documents are genuine, and were preserved in an archive, must of course hold that they are written in their original dialect. To suppose that they have been systematically altered throughout, in such a way as carefully to remove all those traces by which they could be recognized as genuine, is to attribute to the Chronicler or to his predecessors an altogether unexampled stupidity, especially since the archaisms would not in the least impair the intelligibility of the documents.

One of the most significant facts in the history of the development of the old West-Aramaic dialect is the gradual replacement of certain sibilants by their corresponding dentals. In our oldest Aramaic inscriptions, including those (such as the coins of Mazaeus) which date from the fourth century, for example, the relative pronoun is always ܐܝ, and the root of the demonstratives is ܐ; in all the inscriptions (from whatever land) dating from the third century B. C. or later, the relative pronoun is always ܕܝ, and the demonstrative root is ܕ. The condition of things in biblical Aramaic, as regards the sibilants and dentals in general, is altogether like that which is found in classical Syriac and the Aramaic of the Targums; that is, it belongs to the final stage of the development. In the important group of inscriptions from Zenjirli and Nerab, dating from the seventh and eighth centuries B. C., the vocabulary has not yet begun to be "Aramaic" in the matter of these dentals and sibilants. It stands at the opposite extreme, in this regard, from the vocabulary of biblical Aramaic.

The Assuan-Elephantine papyri, which cover the greater part of the fifth century, dating from 471 to 408 B. C., furnish just the added information which was needed, for they occupy, in the most unequivocal manner, the middle ground between the language of the old inscriptions named and that of the Aramaic of the Old Testament. The relative pronoun is ܕܝ, everywhere, and all but invariably. In one text, Cowley's E, ll. 11 and 16, ܕܝ is found, in the combination ܕܝܠܟܝ. Similarly, the demonstrative root, in all the papyri, is ܕ, not ܐ. We have the forms ܐܢܐ, ܐܢܝ, ܐܢܝܐ, ܐܢܝܐ, ܐܢܝܐ, ܐܢܝܐ, a multitude of them in the aggregate; while forms written with ܕ occur twice, ܕܠܟܐ and ܕܠܝ, both found in the same text. In the case of nouns and verbs, the "Aramaic" transformation of the susceptible classes of sibilants is already well under way; we have ܕܝܬܒ (not ܐܝܬܒ), ܕܝܬܒ, etc., also ܕܠܝܬܒ, ܕܠܝܬܒ, "arm," ܕܠܝܬܒ, etc.; but these side by side with ܐܠܝܬܒ, Sachau I, 12, 28; II, 10, and ܐܠܝܬܒ (while in Ezra we have ܐܠܝܬܒ and ܐܠܝܬܒ), Sachau III, 1 f. That is, in the Jewish Aramaic of Egypt which prevailed so late as 408 B. C. the characteristically Aramaic forms of the demonstrative and

relative pronouns were only just beginning to make their appearance, while the more extensive change of which this is only a single manifestation had not progressed far. From the way in which this corresponds to the progress of the same dialect in northern Syria, we can draw a sure conclusion as to the Aramaic which was written at this time in Judea. It is beyond reasonable doubt that if we could come now into the possession of specimens of Palestinian Aramaic of the fourth century B. C., we should find that during this period the 7-forms of the pronouns gradually gained the upper hand, appearing only occasionally in the first part of the century, but becoming the rule during its closing years. Then later on, in the third century, was reached that settled state of things, in this regard, which we see henceforth in biblical Aramaic, the inscriptions of Nabatea and Palmyra, and the other later representatives of the western dialect. Thus the linguistic evidence agrees entirely with the conclusions reached on other grounds.

In numerous other particulars, however, the biblical dialect is itself seen to be in a transitional stage, showing the beginning, or the early stages, of certain tendencies which became fixed at a later day. For example, in the Egyptian papyri, and previously, the preformative of the causative stem is 𐤀, not 𐤁; similarly in the other derived stems which begin with a breathing. In biblical Aramaic several of these forms begin with 𐤁 (see the note above); in the *Megillath Ta'nith* and some of the other old specimens of the later Jewish Aramaic the forms written with 𐤀 are rare; so also in Nabatean inscriptions; later still, they disappear altogether. In the use of the forms 𐤁𐤌𐤀, 𐤁𐤌𐤁 for the pronoun of the 3d pers. sing. masc., biblical Aramaic agrees with the fifth-century papyri (𐤁𐤌𐤁). But in both Daniel and Ezra appears the form 𐤁𐤌𐤁, which soon after became universal (with slight modifications here and there). The use of the proleptic suffix-pronoun, so characteristic of the Aramaic dialects from Ezra and Daniel onward, seems hardly to have begun as early as the fifth century, judging from the papyri and the inscriptions. Another instructive instance is found in the forms of the construct infinitive of the derived verbal stems. For these infini-

tives, *two* nearly identical abstract noun-forms, A קִטְלָה [מִ], etc., and B קִטְלִי [מִ], etc., are chiefly used in the various stages of the language. For the absolute infinitive, forms of type A are everywhere used in biblical Aramaic, and continue to be regular in the Jewish dialects. Forms of type B are regular in classical Syriac, and appear in other gentile dialects; e. g., לְמַחֲשָׁבָר in the Palmyrene Tariff, IIc, l. 4. For the construct infinitive, on the other hand, forms from the type B early gained the upper hand, even in Jewish Aramaic. Doubtless there was a time when constructs formed from A were commonly used, but we see in Ezra and Daniel only the vanishing traces of such a usage. In Ezr. 4:22 we find לְהַנְקִיחַ, and in Dan. 5:12 אֲחִירִית; though some of our recent commentators and editors have wished to "emend" away these most interesting and important examples! Similar forms appear now and then in the later Jewish dialects of Palestine (Dalman, *Gramm.*<sup>2</sup>, 279), see for example Dalman's *Dialektproben*, 16, l. 16, מִפְּקִדוֹן.<sup>36</sup>

The number of these illustrations might easily be increased still further. But enough has been said to show clearly the stage of linguistic development, in general, which is occupied by the Aramaic sections of Ezra.

#### IV. PROPER NAMES AND FOREIGN WORDS

##### 1. Proper Names

In beginning this brief treatment of the proper names which are characteristic of the Aramaic part of Ezra, a preliminary word of a general character may be permitted. The names which Jewish parents in the Persian and Greek periods gave to their children were not always, and perhaps not often, given because of their significance. Doubtless there had been a time, in early Hebrew history, when the etymology of the name was the prime consideration leading to the choice of it; but that time had been long outgrown, and the Jews, like other peoples, had become

<sup>36</sup> Nöldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik*, p. 142, n. 3, regards the final -ā of these absolute infinitives of type A as the emphatic, rather than the feminine, ending. It seems to me that the evidence here presented, in view of the history of the absolute state in old Aramaic and the analogy of the infinitives ending in ִי, is decidedly against this view.

accustomed to choose names simply because they liked the sound of them, or because they were borne by relatives or friends, or for some good omen which (quite irrespective of their origin) they were supposed to carry. This fact is especially evident from the extent to which foreign names were given to the children of Jewish parents. When a Jewish narrator chooses such names as "Esther" and "Mordecai" for his hero and heroine, it is plain that names borrowed from the surrounding peoples were used in those days very much as they are in the most civilized nations at the present time. And all the indications which we have point in this direction. The Chronicler's lists (compiled by him presumably from the names of the prominent Jews of his own time) contain a considerable number of names like "Elam," "Paḥath-Moab," "Nebo," and "Bagoi" (בגוי), all of which designate true Israelites. The writer of the stories in the first part of Daniel names one of his heroes עבר נב, a name which certainly would never have been selected if it had not been well known as Jewish; so also when the pious father Mattathias names one of his boys "Gaddi" (from the heathen god),<sup>37</sup> it is evident that the time had long passed when names had to be taken at their exact face value. We should suppose, moreover, on general grounds, that during the period of Persian rule Babylonian and Persian names would have become popular in Jerusalem and Judea, as well as among the Jews of the Dispersion. This does, in fact, seem to have been the case, as the evidence from Palestine, Babylonia, and Egypt shows us.

It has been quite usual among Old Testament scholars, however, to assume that a Babylonian name means a Babylonian, a Persian name a Persian, and so on. Thus Cowley, *Papyri*, p. 13, speaking of the names which occur in these Jewish-Aramaic records from Upper Egypt: "In some cases the father and son bear names belonging to different languages, which points to racial intermarriage. Thus Satibarzanes is the son of Athar-ili, a name which is itself Assyrianized Aramaean, and Bagadates—the Persian Baga-dāta—is the son of the Babylonian Nabu-kuduri-[uṣur].

<sup>37</sup> See the *Encycl. Bibl.*, article "Maccabees," § 1, col. 2851, where I have tried to show that the names Judah, Simon, Eleazar, Jonathan, etc., were the official names adopted by the Hasmonean princes, not the names given them by their father.

The Babylonians, indeed, seem to have been as numerous at Syênê as the Persians, and like them could hold official posts." But this is, I think, a mistaken view, even where the Jews are not concerned at all. Even in those days, a name was common property, to some extent, and available for any who fancied it. In regard to Jewish names Cowley says (*ibid.*, p. 37): "The name of Hosea's father, Peti-khnûm, *the gift of Khnûm*, seems to imply that the son was a Jewish proselyte. . . . In mediaeval and modern times, however, it is customary to find Jews using two names, one Hebrew and one vernacular for ordinary purposes. Possibly the practice had already begun,<sup>38</sup> and Peti-khnûm and As-ḥor were the non-Hebrew names borne by Jews who were rather lax in their religious views." But we are under no necessity of supposing that the men bearing these names were either gentiles or "Jews who were lax in their religious views," any more than we need suppose that every Jew named "Isidor" is either the child of Egyptian parents or else a worshiper of Isis! Of course it is true that the population of the large cities both in Egypt and in Palestine at this time was a mixture of many races and nationalities; it is also true, doubtless, that some attention was paid to the etymology of names. *As a rule*, Persians bore Persian names, Jews Hebrew names, and so on; but considerable latitude must be left for exceptions to the rule. Sachau, *Papyrusurkunden*, p. 37, writes: "Wenn nun Sanaballaṭ seinen Söhnen jüdische Namen gab, so war er vermutlich von Geburt ein Nichtjudäer, der später zum Judentum übergetreten war, oder er war von Geburt Jude und hatte wegen irgendeiner Rücksicht auf die persische Herrschaft einen babylonischen Namen angenommen. . . . Warum Sanaballaṭ nicht gleich einen persischen Namen anstatt eines babylonischen angenommen, ist nicht ersichtlich." But it is probable that Sanaballaṭ was either a Hebrew of the North-Palestinian stock, or else of Jewish origin, and quite possible in either case that he had borne this name from his childhood. It may well be that the name was borne by many in the land, including

<sup>38</sup> This supposition of occasional double names is correct, as the text published by Sachau shows plainly. 'Anani (אנני), the brother of the high priest in Jerusalem, bore also the Persian name אוסנת.



some devout Jews.<sup>39</sup> "Zerubbabel" is a good Babylonian name, but was probably given, without much thought as to its etymology, to the Jewish boy at his birth. Similarly, "Sheshbazzar" had in all likelihood been naturalized as a Jewish name.

Since the interpretation of not a few of the proper names in the Ezra documents depends on an understanding of the popular Jewish notions in regard to the origin and history of the Samaritans, a preliminary word on that subject will be in place.

The Samaritans claimed to be, and probably were in the main, a Hebrew people of fairly pure blood.<sup>40</sup> The Jews, on the contrary, maddened by the pretensions of this rival temple and its adherents, insisted that the Samaritans were no Hebrews at all. The Jewish tradition as to the origin of this northern community attached itself mainly to II Kings 17:24-41; cf. 17:3-6 and 18:9-11. The narrative as we have it is not historical, but merely fanciful, and appears to date, at least in its present form, from a time later than the Samaritan secession. Be that as it may, it is certain that the standard Jewish tradition asserted that the people who constituted the rival church were a mixed rabble brought into the land by the Assyrian king Shalmanassar. Then it was, according to the tradition, that the great transfer of peoples took place, the heathen being brought in to take the place of the deported Israelites; and the author of this deportation is always said to have been Shalmanassar (cf. Tobit 1:2, 15, 16). The manner in which Ezr. 4:9 f. attaches itself to the account given in II Kings will appear below. This being the case, the statement made in Ezr. 4:2 is very noticeable and interesting. The reason why the Chronicler should thus make the Samaritans ascribe their own deportation to *Esarhaddon* may be conjectured, however. Very likely he reasoned, shrewdly enough, that this documentary admission of their own "heathen" origin would weigh all the heavier against them if it was manifestly independent of the Jewish tradition.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>39</sup> Nöldeke, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, 1907, p. 204, note 2, says in regard to one of the names in Nehemiah: "Ein echter Ammoniter hätte kaum מוֹבִיָּה geheissen." But do we know so definitely as this what an "echter Ammoniter" was, at that time, and how strict the Ammonites were in the matter of names?

<sup>40</sup> So modern anthropologists have generally decided.

<sup>41</sup> The Greek readings of the name in 4:2 are not without interest as characteristic specimens of text-corruption. The L text of Theodotion has [N]αχορδαν; the N coming from

The following is a list of the proper names which are characteristic of these Aramaic documents in Ezra:

**אֲשַׁמְנַסָּר** 4:10. So the massoretic text, with which the Egyptian Greek of Ezra, *Ἀσενναφαρ*, and the Vulgate, *Osnappar*, agree. There is some evidence, however, that this was *not* the reading of the Aramaic text from which Theodotion made his version, early in the second century A. D. The L text gives here *Σαλμανασσάρης*. This is hardly a correction, for the connection with the narrative in II Kings is not a necessary one; moreover, the occurrence of the name *Ἀχορδαν* in the parallel verse 2, just above, shows that no *theory* was at work here. The I Esdras fragment does not contain the passage, which seems to have been interpolated after the time when the old Greek translation was made (see below). In all probability, Josephus had a Greek version of it before him when he wrote, judging from the words οὗς . . . ἀγαγὼν *Σαλμανασσάρης* . . . κατόκισεν ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ (*Antt.* xi, 2, 1). On the basis of this evidence, as well as on the ground of general probability, we may venture to restore "Shalmanassar." From the form **שְׁמִנְסָר**<sup>42</sup> came **אֲמִנְסָר**, and then **אֲשַׁמְנַסָּר**, these changes being only such as have occurred many times over in the proper names of this book. The Egyptian Greek here is the result of correction to correspond with the corrupt reading of our MT.

**אֲשַׁרְיָא** 4:9. The gentilic name of the people of a certain "nation" (**אֲרָמָא**) from which the Samaritans had been

the preceding *ἡμερῶν*, and the *Ἀχορδαν* being a careless haplogram of *Ἀσορχαδαν* (cf. the Vulgate *Asorhaddon*). The reading of the I Esdr. fragment was *Ἀσβασαρεθ* (1), which originated as follows: In the old Greek version **אֲסַרְחַדְדָּן** was transliterated by *ασαρεθων* (or doubtless originally *ασαρεδων*), and this in the process of transmission lost the ambiguous ending *ων* and received at the beginning an increment which may have been due to dittography, but in which the recollection of the name *Σασαβασσαρ* also exercised its influence. The close relationship among the various Hexaplar texts is well illustrated here, both of the blunders in *Ἀσβακαθαθ* (codd. B, N, and the Ethiopic) being reproduced, with one extra one, in **אֲסַרְחַדְדָּן**. Cod. A has the correct reading. The L text gives *Ἀχορδαν*, a conspicuous example of contamination from the canonical Greek.

<sup>42</sup> It is natural to suppose that the **ל** was as commonly omitted as the **א** was in the Greek. In II Kings 17:3, B has *Σαμενασσαρ*; in 18:9, A has *Σαμανασσαρ*. In Tobit 1:2, 15, 16, both recensions read [Σ]εμεσσαρ (the Σ from the word *ἡμέραις* immediately preceding in two of the three passages). In I Esdr. 2:11, 14; 6:17, 19, where the Syrian text substitutes "Shalmanassar" for "Sanabassar," Origen's text had *Σαμανασσαρ* in 2:11 and 14.

recruited. Probably "Persians," the initial א having been transposed by accident from the preceding word.

אפרסתיא 4:9. Another gentilic adjective. Created (on the basis of the word אפרסתיא, 5:6; 6:6) by the interpolator of 4:9 f., in the manner described below.

[א] ארכי Another of the names in the list of 4:9. "Men of Erech;" perhaps originally ארכי (for יא)?

ארתחשטא 7:12 (cf. 7:1; Neh. 2:1, etc.). The form used in the massoretic tradition to designate Artaxerxes II Mnemon; see the name below.

ארתחשטא 4:8, 11, 23. The massoretic way of writing the name of Artaxerxes I Longimanus; that of Artaxerxes II (in Ezr., chaps. 7, 8; Neh., chaps. 2, 5, 13) being always written with ס. Contrast with this the spelling of the name in the Jewish papyri of the fifth century B. C., found in Egypt, where it is always written ארתחשט; so also on the stele from Assuan, *Répertoire d'épigraphie sémitique*, 438, l. 4.<sup>43</sup>

בבליא A gentilic name from the list in 4:9. "Men from Babylon."

דיניא 4:9. Originally the noun "judges," which had been interpolated in the Aramaic text of 4:11 which lay before the "I Esdras" translator; see below. Thence made into a gentilic adjective by the author and interpolator of vss. 9 f.; cf. the note on אפרסתיא.

דריוש 4:24; 5:5; 6:1, etc. Darius (Nothus, according to the view of these Jewish writers). Compare the Egyptian spelling דריוהוש, occurring uniformly in the Jewish Aramaic papyri from Egypt.<sup>44</sup>

טרפליא Gentilic name from the list in 4:9. The only name of a locality which seems to meet the requirements is Τερράπολις. This included Antioch, Seleucia, Apamea, and Laodicea (Strabo, xvi, 749, 750); a region which we should expect to see represented here, since according to II Kings 17:24

<sup>43</sup> It must be remembered, however, that this is the Egyptian form of the name, corresponding to the manner of writing it in the hieroglyphic characters. The form given us by the massoretes differs only slightly from those which we find in the cuneiform records: *Artakšatsu* (KB iv, 312, 4), *Artakšassu* (Stevenson, *Assyr. and Bab. Contracts*, 198, No. 40, 7), etc.

<sup>44</sup> Notice also, in this connection, that the "documents" in Ezra use the late and incorrect form נבוכדינצר, written with נ, which prevailed in the Greek period. So in all three of the passages (5:12, 14; 6:5) where the name occurs.

Shalmanassar brought the Samaritans not only from Babylon, but also "from Hamath." The fact that the verse containing the word was interpolated at a comparatively late day makes it easy to accept this Greek name.

רחום 4:8, 17, 23. The name of the בעל טעם, or "reporter" of the affairs of the province, who dwelt in Samaria in the time of Artaxerxes I. An Aramaic name, and one which the Chronicler is fond of inserting in his lists. The form *Páθυμος*, found in I Esdras, is the result of corruption in the Greek, PAOYMOC becoming PAΘYMOC.

שושנכיא Still another gentile name from the list in 4:9. Apparently "men from Susa." The form is interesting, if the כ really stands for the Persian suffix *-ka*.

שמשי 4:8, 17, 23. Name of the secretary who was associated with Rehūm. Evidently the same name as the Babylonian *Šamaš-a-a*, found in Stevenson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Contracts*, No. 37, l. 17. It also appears in Syria at a later day. The I Esdras reading *Σαμέλλιος* came from CAMEΛIOC = CAMCAIOC; i. e., a copyist carelessly put the cross-bar in the wrong letter.

ששבצר 5:14, 16. I have already discussed this name at length, in dealing with the first chapter of Ezra, and have shown that the I Esdras reading "Sanabassar" is the result of early Greek corruption from *Σασαβασσαρ*. Probably a naturalized Jewish name.

שתרבוני 5:3, 6; 6:6, 13. This is probably a miswriting of the Persian name שתברין, Satibarzanes, which appears in the Assuan papyri (Cowley's A, l. 16, possibly also E, l. 18). Perhaps, however, שתר (N), *Ištar*, + בוני, the Persian ending which appears in the Greek transcription *Μιθροβουζανης*, Diod. Sic. xvii, 21, 3; Arrian, *Anab.*, i, 16, 3. As for the proposal to emend here to 'בתר', it is not even probable that this Jewish narrative was ever written in the old Hebrew characters. It is uncertain, and a matter of small importance, whether the narrator wished to represent the bearer of this name as a Persian or as a Samaritan of Persian extraction, but the latter is more likely.

חַתְנִי 5:3, 6; 6:6, 13. A Babylonian name. The equivalent of the *Taddannu* which is found in Babylonian records of the time of Nabunaid and Cyrus (Muss-Arnolt, *Dictionary*, pp. 1148 f.). That the form *Tattannu* also existed may be taken for granted, since the verb *natānu* (for *nadānu*) is common, and found also in proper names.<sup>45</sup> Originally an abbreviated (hypocoristic) form, cf. the name *Nabū-taddannu*, Muss-Arnolt, *loc. cit.* The pronunciation of the name is correctly transmitted by the massoretes. That the *Θαθθαναί* of cod. A and its fellows is Theodotion's own transliteration needs no argument; the forms *Θανθαναί*, *Τανθαναί*, etc., are arbitrary improvements. The old Greek translator (represented by I Esdras), who was a well-read man, conjectured *Σισίννης*, but the conjecture is of no value for us.<sup>46</sup>

The names *בשלם*, *מִתְרַדָּת*, and *טבאל*, 4:6 (MT 7), may also be mentioned here, though they occur in a verse (the Chronicler's) which is not written in Aramaic. *בשלם* is apparently the Babylonian name *Bēl-šallim*;<sup>47</sup> cf. *Nabū-šallim* (Stevenson, *Assyr. and Bab. Contracts*, p. 148), *Sin-šallimani* (Muss-Arnolt, p. 1042), etc. The original "I Esdras" transliteration was *Βισλεμος* or *Βησλεμος*, and the *σ* was accidentally dropped by a copyist. The "*Βεέλσιμος*" of the I Esdras L text is a flagrant instance of textual contamination, since it is merely one of the corrupt variants of the transliteration of *בעל טעם*: *Βεέλτεμος*, *-ζεμος*, *-σεμος*; which are found here even in the apparatus of Niese's Josephus. As for the other two names: *מִתְרַדָּת*, Mithradates, is Persian, and is employed by the Chronicler also in Ezr. 1:8; *טבאל*, *Tāb-'ēl*, is Aramaic, and occurs also in Isaiah 7:6.

<sup>45</sup> Since this was written, I have seen Clay's article, "Aramaic Indorsements on the Documents of the Murašū Sons," in the *O. T. and Sem. Studies in Memory of W. R. Harper*, Vol. I (1908), pp. 287-321. The name given in his No. 18 (pp. 293, 306) is the very one which is needed. The document is dated in the second year of Darius II, and the name is *Tattannu*, written *תחן* in the accompanying Aramaic characters.

<sup>46</sup> Cowley, *Assuan Papyri*, p. 42, writes: "Two Babylonian contracts of the first and third years of Darius describe Tatnai as *governor of Ebir-nāri*." This is a mistake, based on a conjectural emendation of our text which never had any probability.

<sup>47</sup> By supposing an Aramaic name *Bēl-salām*, "*Bēl* is peace," we could retain the massoretic pointing, *בשלם*. But we have thus far no entirely satisfactory analogies for such a name.

It may be merely accidental, but it is certainly worthy of notice, that in each one of these enumerations by name of the enemies of the Jews, the names are such as to point to as many different nationalities as possible. In 5:3, etc., Tattenai is Babylonian and Satibarzanes is Persian; in 4:8, etc., Reḥūm is native Aramaic, and also Jewish (and of course the Samaritan community was supposed to contain Hebrews and renegade Jews, as well as foreigners), and Shimshai is Babylonian; in 4:6 (7) Bishlam is Babylonian, Mithradath is Persian, and Tab'el is Syrian (representing apparently those Samaritans who were brought from the region of Hamath). It is true, as was pointed out above, that at the time when this was written the nationality of names counted for much less than had formerly been the case; but on the other hand, it cannot be doubted that the Jewish narrators of the time did recognize the distinction between names in this regard, and created "local color" accordingly. And it is quite certain that "even in the Hellenistic period a native of Palestine or of any other country inhabited by Jews might without difficulty have collected a large number of Persian names" (Nöldeke, *Encycl. Bibl.*, article "Esther," § 3).

## 2. *The Foreign Words*

What has just been said in regard to Persian names is also true of other Persian words. The Chronicler, or the author of Daniel, or any other story-teller of the Greek period in Jerusalem, could easily procure as many of these words as he wished to use. When it is observed how much fewer in proportion these Persisms are in the Jewish papyri of Egypt than they are in the Aramaic of Ezra and Daniel, the conclusion lies near at hand that our narrators introduced at least some of them for effect.

The nature and manner of use of one or two of the words, moreover, point in the same direction. Such a common word as the adverb "diligently" need not have been borrowed by the Aramaic from any foreign source; yet we find it eight times, in these Ezra documents, expressed by the one or the other of two curious Persian (?) words which are otherwise unknown. It is hard to believe that this represents the actual usage of any period

of Jewish (or any other) Aramaic. If the adverb occurred only once or twice we might not look on it with suspicion, but this obvious parading of it can hardly be accidental.

It is perhaps not surprising, on any theory, that the origin of about one half of these foreign words should remain more or less obscure. It is usually only the etymology which is uncertain, however, for the meaning is made plain by the context in nearly every case. The most of the words which can be recognized are Persian or Babylonian; two or three are Greek; of the remainder, nothing can be said with confidence at present.

**אדרדא** 7:23. An adverb, meaning "diligently, zealously," as the context shows. It looks like a Persian word, but no plausible explanation of it has been given thus far. It seems to be the equivalent of **אספרינא**; see below.

**אספרינא** 5:8; 6:8, 12, 13; 7:17, 21, 26. Also an adverb, with the same meaning as the preceding—and no other meaning will fit all the places where it occurs. The I Esdras translator renders both alike by *ἐπιμελῶς*. The word is otherwise unknown, and the attempted explanations of it are far-fetched. We are certainly not justified in connecting it with the problematic word in the Aramaic inscription, *CIS*, II, 108. The reading of the word there (generally given as **אספין**) is by no means assured; the sense of the whole inscription is unknown; and the meaning "exact," usually postulated there, will not do at all in the Ezra passages.

**אפרכסא** 5:6; 6:6. An *official title* of the governors of the Transflumen, of whom Tattenai was one. Apparently the Aramaic plural of the naturalized Greek word *ἐπαρχος*, the כ and ס being transposed (naturally; as in Al-iskandar for Alexander, etc.), and the plural ending added in the usual way. These are the **פְּחוּרֵי עֶבֶר הַנְּהַר**, "the eparchs of the Transflumen," *Ezr.* 8:36; *Neh.* 2:7, 9, and *ἐπαρχος* is the usual equivalent (cf. "die ständige Bezeichnung," Meyer, *Entstehung*, 32, note) of **פַּחַר**.<sup>48</sup> It is quite likely that the author of these documents supposed this to be a Persian word.

<sup>48</sup> That Tattenai is thought of here as *the satrap* of the whole Transflumen, is of course not the case. He was the "governor" of his province, just as Zerubbabel, at the same time,

**אֶשֶׁת** 4:13. From the context, evidently a feminine noun signifying "revenue," as scholars have generally agreed. The suggestion of Andreas, "damage" (!), in Marti's glossary, is plainly impossible. Neither the old Greek translator nor Theodotion ventured to render the word. I have no doubt that it is a Greek technical term; either *ἐπίταξις*, "taxation," or *ἐπίθεσις*, "impost," either one of which words might have been transliterated in this way. In favor of the former might be cited the passage Herod. iii, 89, where, in speaking of the imposition of tribute by Darius upon the various divisions of the Persian empire, the phrase *ἡ ἐπίταξις τοῦ φόρου* is used. But the terms *ἐπιτιθέναι*, *ἐπίθεσις*, are also used technically in speaking of the "imposition" of tribute, fines, and the like, and in view of the *exact* transliteration of the latter word it is to be preferred. This explains the gender of the verb **חִהֲנֹק**; the phrase **אֶשֶׁת מַלְכִּין** (notice that it is not **מַלְכָּא** or **מַלְכִּיא**) means *ἡ βασιλικὴ ἐπίθεσις*, "the royal taxation," and the gender of the borrowed word is retained, as usual. Here, again, it is quite likely that the Aramaic narrator did not know the origin of the term, but supposed it to be Persian. It is barely possible that the writing with **פ** is due to a reminiscence of the sound of the Greek *π*. As for the vowel pointing **אֶשֶׁת**, it is exactly as valuable as that of **קָתַרְס**, for *κίθαρις*, in Dan. 3:5, 7, 10.

**אֲשֵׁרְנָא** 5:3, 9. A good illustration of the relative excellency of MT, inasmuch as both the old Greek translator and Theodotion (versions nearly or quite three hundred years apart) had the word before them in the form **אַגְרָא**; the former as **אַגְרָא**, *στέγη*, "roof," and the latter as **אַגְרָא**, *χορηγία*, "outlay" (for hired labor). So long, therefore, as the word given in MT remained otherwise unattested, the only safe critical procedure was to adopt the reading **אַגְרָא**. But now the word **אֲשֵׁרְנָא** has again come to light in the

was governor (**פָּחוּר**, 6:7) in Judea, as Sheshbazzar had been previously (5:14), and as Bagohi is said in the Sachau papyri to have been the **פָּחוּר יְהוּדָה** in the years 411-408. The narrator uses the term **אַפְרִכְסִיָּא**, *ἑπαρχος*, here in the same way that his immediate successor, the Chronicler, uses the equivalent terms in his "Ezra Memoirs," 8:36, where Ezra, after arriving in Jerusalem, hands over the decrees of the king **לְאַחְשֵׁרְפָנִי הַמֶּלֶךְ** **וּפְחֹוֹת עֶבֶר הַנֶּהָר**.



papyri published by Sachau, the reading being quite certain. In the Egyptian document (*Drei aram. Papyrusurkunden*, I, 11) it signifies a part (just which part, is not clear) of the temple at Elephantine; in the Ezra passages, also, it has always been evident that it stands for a part of the temple at Jerusalem. I believe that the word means "colonnade;" that it is the same as the שֵׁרֶן of the Bod-ʿaštar inscription, *CIS*, I, 4, l. 4; and that it is probably to be connected with the Assyrian word *šurinnu*.<sup>49</sup> In the description of the destruction of the Jewish temple in Egypt, first the inner sanctuary is mentioned, with its pillars; then the gates, with their doors; then the roofing, made of beams of cedar; then "the rest of<sup>50</sup> the portico," שִׁירֵית אֲשֶׁרֵנָּה, "and whatever else was there." The phrase "and the columns which were there," used in speaking of the sanctuary proper, may perhaps be taken to imply that there were other columns elsewhere, namely in the outer court. As for the context in Ezra, it is at least natural to suppose that there an important and conspicuous part of the whole structure is meant. Point perhaps אֲשֶׁרֵנָּה? I am of course fully aware of the precarious character of these conclusions.

בלו Only in the standing phrase מַנְדָּה בְּלוּ וְהֶלֶךְ, 4:13, 20; 7:24. בְּלוּ is not to be separated from the Babylonian *abālu*, though the precise nature of the form is still uncertain (perhaps a colloquially shortened form—in this phrase—of בִּלּוֹת = *bilati*?). מַנְדָּה is also a Babylonian loan-word, *mandattu*, as is well known. Also in the form מִנְדָּה, 6:8; Neh. 5:4. הֶלֶךְ, judging from its etymology, means *custom*, "gäng und gebe," binding usage (as regards tribute); cf. הֶלְכָּה, and the English word "custom" meaning tax. It is not likely that it has anything to do with roads, as some have supposed. Probably *not* a loan-word from the Babylonian, though the latter appears to have some closely analogous usage, cf. especially the various uses of *ilku*.

<sup>49</sup> I have previously suggested the connection of the Phoenician word with the Assyrian; *Journal of the Am. Or. Society*, Vol. XXIII, 1902, pp. 171 f.

<sup>50</sup> So read and interpreted by Fraenkel, *Theol. Lit.*, 23 Nov., 1907, and Nöldeke, *ZA*, XXI, 199, while Sachau reads שִׁירֵית.

גִּזְבָּר 7:21. The Persian word "treasurer;" possibly borrowed through the Babylonian, where it also appears.<sup>51</sup>

דָּת 7:12, 14, 21, 25, 26. The Persian word "law." Also used in the Aramaic of Daniel.

הֶלֶךְ Possibly borrowed? See the note on בָּלוּ.

מִנְדָּה See the note on בָּלוּ.

נִשְׁחֹן 4:18, 23; 5:5. Also, in Hebrew, 4:7; 7:11. A noun meaning "letter;" origin not yet satisfactorily explained. The resemblance to old Persian *nipištam*, modern Persian *نوشت*, "writing," is too close to be accidental. Possibly the result of writing down an unfamiliar word from hearsay?

פִּרְשֵׁינָן 4:11, 23; 5:6. Also, in Hebrew, 7:11 and (in the form פִּרְשֵׁינָן) Esther 3:14; 4:8; 8:13. Apparently a genuine Persian loan-word, "copy;" but the origin of the form, and the relation to that found in Esther, are not yet clear.

פִּתְגָּם 4:17; 5:7, 11; 6:11. Also Dan. 3:16; 4:14, and (Hebrew) Esth. 1:20; Eccles. 8:11; very common in later Aramaic and classical Syriac. It is an exact synonym of דָּבָר, i. e. "word," which is occasionally weakened to "thing." It does not mean "answer," nor "decree," nor "message," as is often affirmed; and it thus stands at some distance, both in meaning and in form, from the modern Persian *paighām*, "message" (the "old Persian *patighāma*," from *patigam*, "arrive," has not actually been found). The hypothesis of a Greek loan-word, namely *φθέγμα*, "word, utterance," is more probable on all grounds. The Greek translators render פִּתְגָּם regularly by *ῥῆμα* and *λόγος*; the word in its Syriac form is also used ordinarily to translate *λόγος*, *ῥῆμα*, *ἔπος*, *φθόγγος*, *φθογγή*, *φθέγμα* (Syr.-Hex. in Job 6:26, Wisd. 1:11).

Of the words discussed in the preceding list, at least four are Persian; three (possibly four) are Babylonian; three are Greek; two are altogether unknown, but seem more likely to be Persian (if they are genuine words) than anything else. Counting all their occurrences, they appear in these few chapters more than

<sup>51</sup> As *ganzabaru*; Peiser, in *ZATW* (1897), p. 347. The massoretic pointing is therefore of doubtful value; see also Andreas, in Marti's glossary.

forty times, a very noteworthy fact. Such well-known and understood loan-words as אֶפְרָה, גִּזְזָא, דִּיכָל, פֶּחֶה, which have been truly adopted by the Aramaic, are left out of consideration.

#### V. THE HISTORY OF THE TEXT OF 4:6-11

The restoration of vss. 6-11 which is given here is substantially the same as that which I made in 1895, and printed in my *Composition of Ezra*, p. 6. The principal difference is in the treatment of vs. 8, which I formerly regarded as made up of two parts, namely, (1) the proper names which had been pushed out of vs. 7, and (2) a clause which had originally stood at the end of vs. 10, but was now transposed by the copyist in order to repair the damage which he had done. On further consideration, it has seemed to me that the true explanation is simpler than this, and that vs. 8, in exactly its present wording, originally formed the beginning of the document incorporated by the Chronicler. The conclusion follows of necessity, that the vss. 9-10 are an interpolation; for it is quite obvious that the man who wrote vs. 8 cannot have written the first words of vs. 9 as its continuation. The incorporated narrative, moreover, is not very likely to have begun with the word אֲדִיךָ; but this would have been a natural way of beginning the interpolation, which is, indeed, made in the easiest possible manner. I have always believed the list of names in vs. 9 (see below) to be secondary, and it was for the sake of these, and their fling at the Samaritans, that the interpolation was made. The first clause of vs. 10 is the counterpart of vs. 2β, above, and the remainder is derived from vs. 17. The first clause of vs. 11 might belong either to the interpolation or to the original document; but it is plainly better to regard it in the former way.

This restoration involves no change in the text beyond the returning of "Bishlam, Mithredath, Tabel and his companions" to vs. 6, and the filling of the gap thus made in vs. 7 with the names "Rehum the reporter and Shimshai the scribe." By my former restoration, vss. 9-11 were made to read more smoothly; but an interpolated text is not expected to be smooth. The

suspended construction in vss. 9–11, יָרַח having no direct connection with any verb, is in no way remarkable.

The variation in the tradition of these verses afforded by the I Esdras fragment is both interesting and important. The Greek text<sup>52</sup> reads: <sup>15</sup>Ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐπὶ Ἀρταξέρξου τοῦ Περσῶν βασιλέως χρόνοις κατέγραψεν αὐτῷ<sup>53</sup> κατὰ τῶν κατοικούντων ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ Βίσλεμος<sup>54</sup> καὶ Μιθριδάτης καὶ Ταβέλλιος καὶ Ραούμος<sup>55</sup> καὶ Βεέλτεμος<sup>56</sup> καὶ Σαμσαῖος<sup>57</sup> ὁ γραμματεὺς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ τούτοις συντασσόμενοι, οἰκοῦντες δὲ ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τόποις, τὴν ὑπογεγραμμένην ἐπιστολὴν· <sup>16</sup>Βασιλεῖ Ἀρταξέρξῃ κυρίῳ οἱ παῖδες σου Ραούμος ὁ [γράφων]<sup>58</sup> τὰ προσπίπτοντα καὶ Σαμσαῖος ὁ γραμματεὺς καὶ οἱ ἐπίλοιποι τῆς βουλῆς αὐτῶν κριταὶ<sup>59</sup> οἱ ἐν κοίλῃ Συρίᾳ καὶ Φοινίκῃ. <sup>17</sup>καὶ νῦν γνωστὸν ἔστω κ. τ. έ. The omissions here are very surprising, and almost equally so are the confections or transpositions. But the phenomena are all capable of explanation.

The portions of the Hebrew-Aramaic text of the passage which are represented in this Greek are the following: (1) *Verse 6*, or at all events *6b*, exactly reproduced.<sup>60</sup> In the beginning of the verse the name אֶרְחֶשְׁתָּן was probably substituted at an early date for אֶרְשִׁירִי, and in that case an abridged combination with vs. 7 would have been the natural result. It is perhaps useless to try to determine whether the omission of the half-verse was by accident or by design, and whether made first in the Greek or in the Hebrew; but in my own opinion it is extremely probable that the Hebrew text had been slightly edited here; see further below. (2) *Verse 7a*, every word of which is rendered, while

<sup>52</sup>I have emended the Greek only at those points where the evidence seems conclusive.

<sup>53</sup>The Hexaplar text (inferior, as usual in the Ezra books) has αὐτῶν. So B, Syr., Eth.

<sup>54</sup>Perhaps originally Βίσλαμος, as α and ε interchange with great freedom in the transcripts. For the rest, see above, on the proper names. Of course η and ε were interchangeable at the volition of any scribe. It is not likely that the translator himself wrote η here.

<sup>55</sup>See above, on the proper names.

<sup>56</sup>The reading attested also by Josephus, Βεελέμψ.

<sup>57</sup>The form written by the translator. See above, on the proper names.

<sup>58</sup>The word γράφων, of course, stood here in the original translation, cf. vs. 21. In the I Esdras fragment it had been lost through careless transcription; Josephus had it in the text before him. The L text is arbitrarily emended, as usual.

<sup>59</sup>A has κραταιοὶ (the last syllable derived from the following οἱ); B and Eth. omit the word, though Syr. has it. The Egyptian recension prefixes καί, which Jos. and the Syrian text (Latin, L) rightly omit.

<sup>60</sup>The word שְׁטַח is rendered by ἐπιστολὴν, as also in Theodotion's translation.

considerable additions to it have also been made. These additions will be considered presently. The last clause of the verse, telling how the letter was "written in Aramaic and translated" (into Hebrew), is not rendered at all. This makes it certain that vs. 7*b* was not in the Hebrew text which lay before the translator. It is not the custom of this version to make omissions; the clause in question is interesting and important, and makes no difficulty; it could easily have been incorporated here. (3) The *last word* (כנמא) in *verse 8*, represented by the adjective *ὑπογεγραμμένην*. Of the rest of the verse there is no trace apparent. It was from another source that the added names in vs. 7 were derived, as will be shown. When it is further observed, that the last words in vs. 7*a* are *על ארתחששתא מלך פרס*, while those at the end of the omitted part of vs. 8, standing in a precisely similar context, are *לארתחששתא מלכא*, it is plain that the whole passage, vss. 7*b*, 8, had been accidentally lost from the "I Esdras" Hebrew through the easy mistake of a copyist. (4) *Verse 11*, from *על* (the beginning of the letter) *onward*. That is, the very passage, vss. 9, 10, 11*aa*, which I have already shown to be an interpolation in the Hebrew-Aramaic text is wanting here. From vs. 11*aβ* onward the text is like that of the canonical recension, *except* that in place of the single word *אנש* in vs. 11*b* the Greek has *Παῦρος ὁ γράφων τὰ προσπίπτοντα καὶ Σαμσαῖος ὁ γραμματεὺς καὶ οἱ ἐπίλοιποι τῆς βουλῆς αὐτῶν κριταί*, an expansion which, like the similar one in the translation of vs. 7, evidently was made in order to restore the two (or three) names which had been accidentally lost from the text.

What, then, is the history of these expansions, in the translation of vss. 7 and 11? As for the latter verse, it can hardly be doubted, first of all, that the original reading was the single word *אנש*, as in our massoretic text. Now the words inserted in place of this in the Greek I Esdras are almost an exact rendering of a part of vs. 9, from *רדום* to *דיניא*; the conclusion might therefore seem necessary, that the translator had vss. 9 and 10 before him, but omitted all but these few words which he transposed into the latter part of vs. 11. But several considerations flatly forbid this hypothesis. In the first place, it is incredible that this translator (whose habits we know well) should

omit all this important material, if he had it before him. No difficulty of the passage would have led him to discard it, of this we can be certain. As I have already observed (*Harper Memorial*, p. 78), he is sure to stick closely to a difficult or corrupt text. Again, and more important still, the word דִּינִיָּא in its context in vss. 9 f., does not mean, and could not mean, κριταί. The juxtaposition with the other gentile names, and the express statement in vs. 10 that these names, דִּינִיָּא . . . . עֲלֻמֵּי, are the names of "peoples," leave no room for doubt; and no translator could ever have thought of cutting off the first name in the list and rendering it "judges." The true state of the case, then, is this: vs. 9 of our canonical text was derived from the I Esdras expansion in vs. 11 (see further below), not *vice versa*. The reason why the addition to vs. 11 was made is so obvious as to need no argument. In the accidentally abridged text of this recension there was here no mention of "Rehum the reporter and Shimshai the scribe," that is, of the two officials who according to vss. 17 and 23 sent the letter, received answer to it, and took action accordingly! It was absolutely necessary, in any recension, Aramaic or Greek, that their names should appear in the introduction of the letter. The insertion had been made in the Aramaic text which our translator followed, as the κριταί shows beyond all question. The term דִּינִיָּא, as a general designation for these less usual officials, was probably the best that the editor could have chosen.<sup>61</sup>

But the history of the other expansion of the I Esdras text, the one in vs. 15 (= vs. 7 of the Hebrew), is essentially different. The reason for making the insertion here was the same, it is true; but in this case we have to do with the expansion of the Greek translation, not of the Semitic original. This is proved by the presence of the gloss Βελέτμενος, which appears also in vs. 21 (= vs. 17 of the Aramaic text), the source from which the whole addition was derived. Vs. 15 (= vs. 7 of the Hebrew) was very troublesome in its abridged state, for it declared that "Bishlam, Mithredath, and Tabel" were the authors of "the following

<sup>61</sup> As a mere coincidence with the phrase רַבְּנֵיהֶון דִּינִיָּא in Ezr. 4:11 ("I Esdras" version) the occurrence of the phrase רַבְּנֵיהֶון דִּינִיָּא, "and his colleagues the judges," in Cowley's papyrus B, l. 6, is interesting.

letter," τὴν ὑπογεγραμμένην ἐπιστολήν. A translator might well allow this to pass (especially since the difficulty had been lessened by the interpolation made in the Aramaic of vs. 11), and it was in fact left untouched by our translator; but the contradiction was still so great that it could not long be permitted to stand. Hence the clause, Ραῦμος καὶ Βεέλτεμος καὶ Σαμσαῖος ὁ γραμματεὺς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ τούτοις συντασσόμενοι, οἰκοῦντες δὲ ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τόποις, was taken over bodily from vs. 21 and inserted in vs. 15 after the other names. As for the Βεέλτεμος, it certainly did not stand in the original rendering. The translator who knew that בעל טעם meant "reporter,"<sup>62</sup> ὁ γράφων τὰ προσπίπτοντα, would not also have treated it as a proper name, and his rendering in vs. 16 shows that he did not so treat it. The gloss was made by some later hand in vs. 21, and was transferred thence to vs. 15 with the rest of the passage.

The Hebrew-Aramaic<sup>63</sup> text of this passage, Ezr. 4:6-12, in the I Esdras recension therefore read as follows:

וּבִימֵי אֶרְחֶשְׁתָּא מֶלֶךְ פָּרַס כָּתַב עָלָיו בְּשֵׁלֶם מְחִרְחָ  
טְבָאֵל וּשְׂאָר כְּנֻחִין שְׁטֵנָה עַל יִשְׁבִּי יְהוּדָה וִירוּשָׁלַם כְּנֻמָּא<sup>64</sup> עַל<sup>11</sup>  
אֶרְחֶשְׁתָּא מֶלֶכָא, עֲבָדִיק רַחֵם בְּעַל טַעַם וּשְׁמַשִּׁי סְפָרָא וּשְׂאָר  
כְּנֻחֵהוֹן<sup>65</sup> דִּי בַעֲבַר נְהִירָה<sup>66</sup> ◊<sup>12</sup> וּכְנַעְנָה: <sup>(12)</sup> יָדִיעַ לְהוּא וְגו'.

This text differs from the massoretic in the following particulars:

(1) Vss. 6 and 7 have been editorially combined, as already stated; (2) Vss. 7b and 8 (except the last word) have been lost by the accident of transcription mentioned above; (3) Vss. 9, 10, 11a, interpolated by a later hand in our massoretic text, are wanting here; (4) The editor has made the (absolutely necessary) insertion in vs. 11 very skilfully.

The Greek translator reproduced his original *verbatim*, as usual; and his rendering here has come down to us intact except-

<sup>62</sup> See the note on the translation of 4:7 (8).

<sup>63</sup> The material out of which the introductory verse was made was undoubtedly left just as it was: all Hebrew with the exception of the last word, כְּנֻמָּא.

<sup>64</sup> This word certainly stood in the text. When the copyist's eye strayed from the king's name in vs. 7 to the same name in vs. 8, it caught this preparatory word also.

<sup>65</sup> The same form which occurs (correctly) in both vss. 17 and 23. The translator, who had just rendered the phrase in the preceding sentence, now varies the rendering on literary grounds, as he frequently does elsewhere.

<sup>66</sup> The שְׁלֹם was missing here, as well as in the canonical version.

ing one particular, namely, that at a later day some one found it necessary to harmonize vs. 15 (=vss. 6, 7) with its context by inserting in it a paraphrase—almost word for word—of the greater part of vs. 21.

Finally, as to the verses, 9, 10, 11*aa*, which have been interpolated in our massoretic text. They were written by some one who had before him both recensions of the Hebrew-Aramaic (namely, the original form and the I Esdras form), and whose purpose was to deal the Samaritans a more telling blow. The interpolator saw the opportunity of showing still farther, in the introduction to this official document, what a mixed rabble the Samaritans really were, by naming some of the regions from which Shalmaneser<sup>67</sup> had brought them. That his knowledge of geography and history was not very extensive is at least suggested by the last four names in the list, “Persians, people of Erech, Babylonians, people of Susa (who are Elamites).” As for the טרפליא, they are presumably “people of Tetrapolis,” as has already been shown. But it is most important of all to observe that *the two first names in the list*, namely דיניא and אפרס(ת)כיא, are the words used in the documents themselves (as they lay before the interpolator) to designate these enemies of the Jews; namely in 4:11 (I Esdras original); 5:6; 6:6. Whether the interpolator recognized them as official titles or not, it is at all events certain that he proceeded to use them as gentile names, thus completing his curious list. Moreover, by the continuation in vs. 10, “and the rest of the peoples,” etc., he leaves abundant room for still other heathen ancestors of the rival community.

The way in which the interpolation was made is as simple as possible. The text used as the basis was of course the more complete and (obviously) more correct one. For the beginning of the insertion, the secondary clause in the I Esdras text of vs. 11 (see above) was adopted *verbatim*, and the description of these “associates” was then continued in the manner just described. The whole was introduced by the word ארִיך; it is hard to imagine any other way in which the interpolation could have been effected so easily.

<sup>67</sup> See above, on the proper name אסנפר.



## VI. THE TEXT OF THE PASSAGES

Our massoretic text of these Aramaic passages in Ezra is very well preserved, in the main. It has retained some old forms and readings which had disappeared both from Theodotion's text and from the original of the "I Esdras" recension. Even the vowel-pointing is usually (but of course not always) trustworthy, in these Aramaic passages. For the interpretation of the text, the old Greek translation, of which we now have only the fragments preserved in I Esdras, is very valuable because of its great age. It was made about three centuries earlier than that of Theodotion (our "canonical" version), at a time when many words and matters were still familiar which soon after ceased to be understood.

On the system of punctuation adopted for the text here printed, see this *Journal*, Vol. XXIV, pp. 10 ff.

## SAMARITAN INTRIGUES AGAINST THE BUILDING OF THE TEMPLE

(Ezr. 4:4—6:19)

The Chronicler  
(Hebrew)

4' וַיְהִי עִם הָאָרֶץ<sup>a</sup> מִרְפִּים יָדַי עִם יְהוּדָה, וּמִבְּהֵלִים אֹתָם  
לְבָנוֹת<sup>c</sup> וּסְכָרִים עֲלֵיהֶם יוֹעֲצִים<sup>b</sup> לְהַפִּיר עֲצָתָם, כֹּל יְמֵי כוֹרֶשׁ<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> The manner in which this phrase is frequently replaced by עַמֵּי הָאֶרֶץ, in the Chronicler's narrative (see my *Composition*, p. 18), may show us his idea of the population of Palestine in that day. The returning Jewish exiles had as their neighbors (aside from Phoenicians, Philistines, Moabites, Ammonites, etc.) merely the motley throng of heathen "peoples of the lands" brought in by the Assyrians. When he uses the term he has the Samaritans in mind.

<sup>b</sup> As Bertholet and others have remarked, these "counselors" are thought of as at the Persian court. I believe that the Chronicler had in mind some of the ministers of the king, using the term יוֹעֲצִים exactly as he does in I Chron. 27:33, Ezr. 7:14, 15 (Aramaic), 28; 8:25.

<sup>c</sup> The purpose of the Chronicler to make his history con-

מֶלֶךְ פָּרְסִים<sup>d</sup> וְעַד מַלְכֵיית דְּרִיּוֹשׁ מֶלֶךְ פָּרְסִים<sup>d</sup> ◯  
 וּבַמַּלְכֵיית אֲחֶשְׁוֶרֶשׁ, בַּתְּחֵלֶת מַלְכוּתוֹ, קָתְבוּ<sup>e</sup> בְּשֵׁלֶם מִתְרַדָּת  
 טָבָאֵל<sup>e</sup> וְשֹׁאֵר כְּנוֹתָיו<sup>f</sup> שְׁטִנָּה עַל יִשְׁבִּי יְהוּדָה וִירוּשָׁלַם ◯  
 וּבִימֵי אֲרִתַּחֲשֻׁתָא<sup>g</sup> קָתְבּ רַחוּם בְּעַל טַעַם<sup>h</sup> וְשִׁמְשִׁי<sup>i</sup> הַסִּפֵּר<sup>k</sup> עַל

tinuous, in this verse and those which follow, is quite unmistakable—and he would have damaged his own work seriously, at this point, if he had not done so! During the reign of Cyrus, high Persian officials, bribed for the purpose, managed to stop the building of the temple. Then followed, *immediately*, the reign of Xerxes, at the very “beginning” of which Bishlam and his associates wrote their effective accusation.

<sup>d</sup> This clause is one of the remaining traces of the redactional process through which our book of Ezra has passed. When the Story of the Three Youths was interpolated and the letters 4:6–24 (*n. b.*) were transposed, the interpolator who made the new edition left the two (now consecutive) verses 4:5 and 5:1 exactly as they were. But the necessity of putting some bridge across this gap was imperative, and our two surviving texts contain each a clause written for this purpose; namely, the one before us, and the words “and they were hindered from building until the second year of the reign of Darius” (incorrectly rendered by the Greek translator) in I Esdras 5:70 (73). When the makers of our canonical edition cut out the Story and restored the letters to their original place, they of course left 4:5 in its expanded form.

<sup>e</sup> See above, on the proper names.

<sup>f</sup> A genuine Aramaic word, not a loan-word.

<sup>g</sup> On the orthography of this name see above, the proper names.

<sup>h</sup> I have pointed this in the Hebrew manner, since it now stands in a Hebrew verse, as it originally stood. But it may well be that these Aramaic titles, **בְּעַל טַעַם** and **סִפֵּר** were retained by the Chronicler in their official Aramaic form.

<sup>i</sup> See above, on the proper names.

<sup>k</sup> See note h.

אַרְתַּחֲשֻׁתָּא מֶלֶךְ פָּרַס, וְכָתַב הַנִּשְׁתָּן כְּתוּב אַרְמִית וּמִתְרָגֵם<sup>1</sup> ○

Aramaic  
Writer

○ רַחוּם בְּעַל טַעַם וְשִׁמְשִׁי סָפָא כְּתַבּוּ אֲנָא חָדָא עַל יְרוּשָׁלַם  
לְאַרְתַּחֲשֻׁתָּא מֶלֶכָא כִּנְמָא<sup>2</sup> ○<sup>3</sup> אֲדִין רַחוּם בְּעַל טַעַם וְשִׁמְשִׁי סָפָא  
וְשָׂאָר כְּנֻתְהוּן, דִּינָא<sup>4</sup> וְאַפְרַסְתָּא טְרַפְלָא פֶּרְסָא<sup>5</sup> אֲרַכְנָא<sup>6</sup> בְּבִלָּא  
שׁוּשַׁנְכָא, דִּי הוּא<sup>7</sup> עֲלִמָּא<sup>8</sup> ○<sup>9</sup> וְשָׂאָר אֲמִיָּא דִּי הַגְּלִי שְׁלִמְנָסָר, רָפָא וּנְקִירָא,  
וְהוּתַב הַפּוֹל בְּקֶרְיָה<sup>10</sup> דִּי שְׁמִרִין וְשָׂאָר עֲבַר נְהֶרָה<sup>11</sup> ○ דָּנָה פֶּרְשֵׁנָא אֲנָתָא דִּי  
שְׁלָחוּ עֲלוּהִי:

<sup>1</sup>The word אַרְמִית, which stands here in MT, is a later addition intended to give warning (as in Dan. 2: 4) that the following passage is Aramaic.

<sup>2</sup>The Brown-Driver-Briggs *Lexicon* says, "derivation uncertain." But where is the possibility of any uncertainty, in view of חֲפָצָא, בְּרַם, כְּלוּם, מִדְעַם, etc., the Assyrian enclitic *-ma*, and other similar formations? I would add to the list of these *ma*-forms מַנְסָר, "person" or "face" (Guidi, *I sette dormienti*, p. 19, l. 7) = [εἰ]κὼν + *ma*. I believe that we have the original *'kōn*, fully naturalized, in the Ešmun'azar inscription, ll. 4, 20, קָן אִתָּא, "whosoever thou art;" cf. the Tabnit inscription, l. 3, and the two Nerab inscriptions, I, l. 5 and II, l. 8.

<sup>3</sup>On the peculiar history of this word and the one which follows it, see above, pp. 253 f.

<sup>4</sup>The א which stands at the beginning of this word in MT is the result of a copyist's mistake; see above.

<sup>5</sup>Probably אֲרַכְנָא, as suggested above?

<sup>6</sup>MT דִּינָא. This explanatory clause is not necessarily the work of a later hand; the original narrator himself occasionally wishes to explain a word or a phrase. Cf. Wright's *Joshua the Stylite*, 9, 16, which is an exact parallel.

<sup>7</sup>MT אֲסַנְפֶר; see above, on the proper names.

<sup>8</sup>Should this be pronounced קֶרְיָה? It is at all events *plural*, i. e., the collective noun regularly used in Syriac, כְּנָנָא. It cannot possibly be the undetermined singular here (as in vs. 15, קֶרְיָא), and the determined singular, קֶרְיָתָא, occurs seven times over in this chapter. שְׁמִרִין here is *the province of Samaria*; moreover, this whole phrase is a direct quotation of the twice

על ארתחשטא מלכא, עבדיך אנש עבר נהרה, <sup>⊙</sup> <sup>12</sup> וכענת <sup>⋄</sup>  
 (12) ידיע להיא <sup>⋄</sup> למלכא, די יהודיא די סלקו מן לחתך עלינא אתו;  
 לירושלם <sup>⋄</sup> קריחא מרדחא ובאישתא בנין, ושוריא אשכללו <sup>⋄</sup> ואשיא  
 יחשו <sup>⊙</sup> <sup>13</sup> כען ידיע להיא למלכא, די הן קריחא דך תחבנא

occurring phrase [יִלְשָׁב] בערי שמרון, in the all-important "Samaritan passage" II Kings 17:24, 26. Observe that even Theodotion and Jerome render by the plural: *ἐν πόλεσιν τῆς Σομορών*, in *civitatibus Samariae*.

<sup>1</sup> MT adds *וכענת*, evidently derived by a copyist's mistake from the following verse.

<sup>u</sup> Since the *שלם* is missing in both MT and I Esdras, I have not ventured to insert it, though it seems to me most likely that it was in the original text. It is probably merely an accidental coincidence that the same word has disappeared from 7:12, where it certainly once stood.

<sup>v</sup> My explanation of this word as the equivalent of *أما بعد*, *Journ. Bib. Lit.*, 1897, pp. 166 ff., has been proved correct by the Egyptian papyri. In the letter published by Sachau, *Drei aram. Papyrusurkunden*, I, 4, II, 2, the word occurs in exactly this usage, while the full form *כענת* is found in the papyri published by Cowley.

<sup>w</sup> In the Egyptian papyri, this form is written everywhere *ידורה*, not as in Ezra and Daniel.

<sup>x</sup> This seems the most probable way of connecting this word, especially in view of the absence of any demonstrative pronoun after it.

<sup>y</sup> MT has *ושורי אשכללו*, and would transpose the *א* to the preceding word, leaving the verb in the perfect tense. It is plain from vs. 13, however, that the perfect cannot have been intended. I believe that this is one of the many cases in which initial *א* and *א* interchange phonetically, and that the form is really imperf. third person plural. Cf. Dalman, *Gramm.*<sup>2</sup>, p. 252, and the well-known state of the case in classical Syriac. This imperfect, like the one which follows it, doubtless ended in *ū*.

<sup>z</sup> The word should be written *יחשו* (= *יחשו*), without the *י*.

וּשְׁוֹרִיא יִשְׁתַּכְּלֵלוּ, מִנְדָּה בְּלוֹ וְהִלָּךְ<sup>a</sup> לֹא יִנְתַּנוּן, וְאַפְתָּס<sup>b</sup> מַלְכִין<sup>c</sup>  
 תַּחֲמֹק<sup>d</sup> ○ "בֶּן כָּל־קָבֶל דִּי מַלְחָה הֵיכְלָא מַלְחָנָא, וְעִרְוֹת מַלְכָּא  
 לֹא אֲרִיךְ לָנָה לְמַחְוָא, עַל דְּנָה שְׁלַחְנָא וְהוֹדְעָנָא<sup>e</sup> לְמַלְכָּא, ○<sup>15</sup> דִּי

It is a *haph'el* imperfect from the root חטט, corresponding to the Arabic حط (not خط), and with exactly the same meaning, "lay." The I Esdras translation, ὑποβάλλονται, is not a bad rendering. The *first* stem of the Arabic verb is used both transitively ("lay") and intransitively ("come down"). The *fourth* stem also is used with the meaning "put down, lay," just as the corresponding form, the *haph'el*, is used here in Aramaic. The verb is common in Arabic, but has not thus far been found elsewhere in the cognate languages.

<sup>a</sup>On these three words see above, the section dealing with the foreign words.

<sup>b</sup>The Greek ἐπίθεσις; see above, on the foreign words. MT אַפְתָּס.

<sup>c</sup>The final ם in MT is probably a mere copyist's error for ך. We have no other evidence of an Aramaic plur. in -īm. This is not a Hebraism.

<sup>d</sup>This *haph'el* has two uses: the one causative, as in vss. 15, 22; the other signifying to come into the condition (viz., of deterioration), as this stem is so frequently used in Semitic. Cf. the two uses of הַצִּלַּח, Dan. 3:30 and 6:29. The fem. form here because of the (Greek) fem. noun; see above.

<sup>e</sup>It is often said (e. g., by Marti, *Gramm.*, p. 98; Strack, *Gramm.*, p. 56; Brown-Driver-Briggs, *Lexicon*) that this is wrongly divided and pointed, and that the form should be כָּלְקָבֶל. But this is not true; the massoretes have divided and pointed correctly. The shifting of the vowel is very natural, and has many analogies; and as for the division, it is not a whit more remarkable than in שָׁל, Eccles. 8:17, cf. Jonah 1:7, 8; or דִּיל (as a separate word) in the Palmyrene inscriptions; or than in مَلْ أَشْيَاءَ, for مِلْ الْأَ (Nöldeke, *Delectus vet. carm. arab.*, 10, 4; Goldziher, *Abhandl. zur arab. Philol.*, II, p. xiv). These are local and temporary habits of orthography.

<sup>f</sup>The epistolary perfect; "we *hereby* send and make known."

יִבְקְרוּ<sup>§</sup> בַּסֵּפֶר דְּכַרְנִיָּא<sup>h</sup> דִּי אֲבָהֶתֶךָ; וְתַחֲשַׁכַּח בַּסֵּפֶר דְּכַרְנִיָּא וְתַנְדַּע.  
 דִּי קָרִיתָא דֶּךָ קָרִיא מָרְדָּא וּמִתְנַזְקַת מַלְכִין וּמִדִּינָן, וְאַשְׁתַּדּוּר<sup>i</sup>  
 עֲבָדִין בְּגִיָּה מִן יוֹמָת עֲלֻמָּא: עַל דְּנָה קָרִיתָא דֶּךָ תְּחַרְבַּת ◊  
<sup>16</sup> מִהוֹדְעִין אֲנַחְנָה לְמַלְכָּא, דִּי הֵן קָרִיתָא דֶּךָ תְּחַבְּנָא וְשׁוּרִיא  
 יִשְׁתַּכְּלֻלֵין, לְקַבֵּל דְּנָה חֶלֶק בַּעֲבָר נְהֹרָא לֹא אֲחִי לֶךָ ◊  
<sup>17</sup> פְּתֻנְמָא<sup>k</sup> שְׁלַח מַלְכָּא: עַל רַחוּם בַּעַל טַעֲם, וְשִׁמְשִׁי סְפָרָא,  
 וְשֹׁאֵר כְּנֻתְהוּן<sup>l</sup> דִּי יְתֻבִּין בְּשִׁמְרִין<sup>m</sup> וְשֹׁאֵר עֵבֶר נְהֹרָה, שְׁלָם ◊  
<sup>18</sup> וּכְפֻתָּא<sup>n</sup>:<sup>(18)</sup> נְשִׁתּוּנָא דִּי שְׁלַחְתּוּן עֲלִינָא מִפְּרִשׁ ◊ קָרִי קְדָמִי ◊  
<sup>19</sup> וּמִנִּי שִׁים טַעֲם, וּבִקְרוּ וְתַשְׁכַּחוּ דִּי קָרִיתָא דֶּךָ מִן יוֹמָת עֲלֻמָּא  
 עַל מַלְכִין מִתְנַשְׂאָה, וּמִרְדּוּ וְאַשְׁתַּדּוּר מִתְעַבֵּד בֵּה ◊<sup>20</sup> וּמַלְכִין  
 תְּקִיפִין הוּוּ עַל יְרוּשָׁלַם, וְשְׁלִיטִין בְּכָל עֵבֶר נְהֹרָה, וּמְנַדָּה בְּלוּ  
 וְהֶלֶךְ מִתִּיחָב לְהוּן ◊<sup>21</sup> כַּעַן שִׁימוּ טַעֲם לְבִטְלָא גְבַרִיא אֵלֶךְ:  
 וְקָרִיתָא דֶּךָ לֹא תְחַבְּנָא, עַד מִנִּי טַעֲמָא יְתַשֵּׁם ◊<sup>22</sup> וְזוֹדִירִין הוּוּ  
 שְׁלוּ לְמַעֲבַד<sup>p</sup> עַל דְּנָה: לָמָּה יִשְׁגָּא חֶבְלָא לְהִנְזַקְתָּ מַלְכִין ◊  
<sup>23</sup> אֲדִין, מִן דִּי פִרְשָׁנָן נְשִׁתּוּנָא דִּי אֲרַתְחַשְׁתָּא מַלְכָּא קָרִי קְדָם

§MT יבקר, but this is shown to be wrong by the suffix at the end of the clause. The form adopted (which might be either indicative or jussive) is better than יבקרין.

<sup>h</sup>ספר דכרן, "record-book," cf. Mal. 3:16, is virtually a compound word (Marti, *Gramm.*, §117; Kautzsch, *Hebr. Gramm.*, §124, 2), and this is its plural, "record-books." So the old Greek translator and Jerome, rightly. Other plur. compounds of this same sort in 5:17; 6:1.

<sup>i</sup>Apparently an example of initial **א** replacing the more original **ה**. See above, on the language of these documents.

<sup>k</sup>Probably a naturalization of the Greek *φθέγμα*; see above.

<sup>l</sup>The suffix by no means to be altered to the second person; see the note on 6:6.

<sup>m</sup>Not the city, but the province.

<sup>n</sup>This same form, and similarly used, in the letter published by Sachau, *Drei aram. Papyrusurkunden*, II, l. 2; cf. I, l. 4.

<sup>o</sup>Circumstantial accusative of the passive participle.

<sup>p</sup>Cf. the Arabic idiom, Wright, *Gramm.*, II, 27 B, 304 C.

<sup>q</sup>See above, on the Aramaic of these documents.

רחום ושְׁמִשׁ סִפְרָא וּכְנֻת־הוֹן, אֲזָלוּ בְּהִילּוֹ לִירוּשָׁלַם עַל יְהוּדִיָּא, וּבְשָׁלוֹ הָמֹז בְּאַדְרַע וְחִיל ◯ <sup>24</sup> בְּאַדְרַךְ בְּטֶלַת עֲבִידַת בֵּית אֱלֹהָא דִּי בִירוּשָׁלַם, וְהָדָא בְּטֶלַא עַד שְׁנַת חֲרָתִין לְמַלְכוּת דְּרִיוֹשׁ מֶלֶךְ פָּרַס ◯ <sup>1</sup> וְהַתְּנִבִי חֲפִי נְבִיאָהָ, וְזִכְרִיהָ בְּרַעְדָּא, נְבוּאָהָ עַל יְהוּדִיָּא דִּי בִיהוּדָא וּבִירוּשָׁלַם, בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל עֲלִיהוֹן ◯ <sup>2</sup> בְּאַדְרַךְ קָמֹז זֶרְבָּבֶל בְּרַעְדָּא לְיִשׁוּעַ בְּרַעְדָּא, וְשִׁרְיָו לְמִבְנֵא בֵּית אֱלֹהָא דִּי בִירוּשָׁלַם; וְעִמְהוֹן נְבִיאָא דִּי אֱלֹהָא מְסַדִּין לְהוֹן ◯ <sup>3</sup> בְּהָ זְמַנָּא אֲתָה עֲלִיהוֹן תַּתְּנִי, פָּתַח עֲבֵר נְהִירָה, וּשְׁתַּרְבּוּזִי וּכְנֻת־הוֹן, וְכֵן אֲמַרִין לְהֵם: <sup>4</sup> מֶן שֵׁם לְהֵם טַעַם, בִּיתָא דְנָה לְפִנָּא וְאַשְׁרָנָא דְנָה לְשַׁכְלָהָ ◯ <sup>5</sup> אֵת שְׁאֲלִין לְהֵם: מֶן אֲנֹן שְׁמָהָת

<sup>1</sup>The manner of the connection here is strong added evidence that 4:24 was *not* written by the Chronicler, but by the author of 4:23 and 5:1 ff.; see above.

<sup>2</sup>So written (*ketib*) both here and 6:14, but probably already pronounced נְבִיאָהָ.

<sup>3</sup>The superiority of this reading would be obvious enough even if we did not have Theodotion's *προφητεῖαν*, showing that the word actually stood in his text. Cf. also 6:14.

<sup>4</sup>This, of course, does not imply that no building had been done before! This is the characteristic redundant use of the Aramaic verb "begin;" see this *Journal*, XXIII, 191.

<sup>5</sup>The Babylonian name *Tattannu*, see above.

<sup>6</sup>MT very likely corrupt; see above, on the proper names.

<sup>7</sup>This, like most of the other so-called "Hebraisms" in Ezra and Daniel, is pure Aramaic. On the whole question see now Herbert H. Powell, *The Supposed Hebraisms in . . . Biblical Aramaic*, Berkeley, Cal., 1907.

<sup>8</sup>Inasmuch as this same form occurs twice in the Hadad inscription, ll. 13, 14, it is, of course, to be retained. The pointing of the massoretes is probably correct. Apparently a variation of *לְמִבְנֵא*, with compensatory doubling of the ב.

<sup>9</sup>See above, on the foreign words. Both the old Greek translator and Theodotion had אֲנָרָא before them here. Point possibly אֲשִׁרָנָא?

<sup>10</sup>MT has for these two words אֲנָרָא אֲשִׁרָנָא. The second

גבריא די דנה בנינא בנין <sup>5</sup> ויעין אלהיהם הות על שְׁבִי יהודיא.  
ולא בטלו המו. עד טעמא <sup>6</sup> לדריוש יִהְיֶה <sup>7</sup> ואדין יתיבון נשתנא  
על דנה <sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> פרשגן אפרתא די שלח תתני פחת עבר נהרה ושתרבוני.  
וכננתה <sup>7</sup> אפרכטיא <sup>8</sup> די בעבר נהרה. על דריוש מלכא <sup>9</sup> פתגמא  
שלחו עלוהי. וכדנה כתיב בגנה:

לדריוש מלכא. שלמא כלא <sup>10</sup> ידיע להיא למלכא. די אזלנא  
ליהודי מדינתא לבית אלהא רבא. והוא מתבנא אבן גלל. ואע  
מתשם בכתליא: ועבדתא דך אספרנא <sup>11</sup> מתעבדא. ומצלח בידהם <sup>12</sup>  
<sup>9</sup> אדין שאלנא לשביא אלך. כנמא אמרנא להם: מן <sup>13</sup> שם לכם  
טעם. ברתא דנה למבניה <sup>14</sup> ואשרנא <sup>15</sup> דנה לשכללה <sup>16</sup> ואה <sup>17</sup>

and third of these were derived by a copyist's mistake from the similar passage in vs. 9; it was then necessary to change the אה to אדין. With the restored text cf. the beginning of vs. 10.

<sup>6</sup> "News," as in the title בעל טעם.

<sup>7</sup> So also in the Egyptian papyri, the forms אהך and תהך (Cowley, *op. cit.*).

<sup>8</sup> The singular suffix, as in 4:6 (7); a merely literary variation from the more frequent plural. The suffix refers to the nearer one of the two names.

<sup>9</sup> Aramaic adaptation of the Greek *ἐπαρχος*; see above. MT אפרכטיא. Perhaps the כ and ס were actually transposed in the Jewish pronunciation of the word.

<sup>10</sup> This word, "Judea," occurs in the letter from the Jews of Elephantine, 408 B. C., published by Sachau, I, 1.

<sup>11</sup> A word of unknown origin; see above.

<sup>12</sup> It is safest to retain this Jewish pointing, מן instead of מן, until we know more about it.

<sup>13</sup> This form should not be "emended" away, especially since precisely similar forms are found in the Palestinian Talmud and the Jerusalem Targums (Dalman, *Gramm.*<sup>2</sup>, 340, 349). So also in biblical Hebrew, and especially when ל is joined to the infinitive, Gesen.-Kautzsch, § 45, *d, e*. In Ezr. 7:9, indeed, we seem to have an Aramaizing infin. of just this sort, מעלה (Gesen.-



שְׁמֵהֶם שְׁאֵלָנָא לָהֶם לְהוֹדְעוֹתָךְ, דִּי נִכְתּוּב שְׁם<sup>1</sup> גְּבִרָא דִּי  
 בְּרָאשִׁיהֶם<sup>m</sup> ◊<sup>11</sup> וּכְנִמָּא פִתְגָמָא הִתִּיבּוּנָא, לְמִמֵּר<sup>n</sup>: אֲנַחְנָא  
 הָמּוּ עֲבָדוּהִי דִּי אֱלֹהֵי שְׁמִיא וְאַרְעָא; וּבְנִין בֵּיתָא דִּי הוּא בְּנֵה  
 מְקַדְמִת דְּנָה שְׁנִין שְׁנִיָּאן, וּמֶלֶךְ לְיִשְׂרָאֵל רַב בְּנָהִי וּשְׁכַלְלָה ◊<sup>12</sup>  
 לְהֵן<sup>o</sup> מֶן דִּי הִרְגִּזּוּ אֲבָהֶתָנָא לְאַלֵּה שְׁמִיא, יִהָב הָמּוּ בִיד  
 נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר<sup>p</sup> מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל כְּסָדְיָא, וּבֵיתָה דְּנָה סְתִירָה וְעַמָּה הַגְּלִי  
 לְבָבֶל<sup>q</sup> ◊<sup>13</sup> בְּרִם בִּשְׁנַת חֲדָה לְכוּרֵשׁ מַלְכָּא דִּי בָבֶל, כּוּרֵשׁ מַלְכָּא  
 שֵׁם טַעַם בֵּית אֱלֹהָא דְּנָה לְבִנָּא<sup>r</sup> ◊<sup>14</sup> וְאַךְ מְאַנִּיא דִּי בֵּית אֱלֹהָא,  
 דִּי נְהִיבָה וּכְסָפָא, דִּי נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר הִנְפֵּק מֶן הֵיכְלָא דִּי בִירוּשָׁלַם  
 וְהִיבֵל הָמּוּ לְהֵיכְלָא דִּי בָבֶל, הִנְפֵּק הָמּוּ כּוּרֵשׁ מַלְכָּא מֶן הֵיכְלָא  
 דִּי בָבֶל, יְהִיבּוּ לְשִׁשְׁבָצַר<sup>s</sup> שְׁמֵה<sup>t</sup>, דִּי פָחַה שְׁמֵה ◊<sup>15</sup> וְאַמֵּר לָהּ:

Kautzsch, *l. c.*). These isolated occurrences are too valuable to be thrown away.

<sup>k</sup> See the note on this word in vs. 3.

<sup>l</sup> This is correct as it stands.

<sup>m</sup> There is no Hebraism here. As for the "un-Aramaic" pronunciation with ܐ instead of ܐ, is not this what we see preserved in the modern name of the important town *Rāšēyā*, ܐܪܫܝܐ, at the northern foot of Hermon? (We seem to have similar survivals of this Aram. plur. ending in the names of the towns *Hāsēyā*, ܗܫܒܝܐ, west of Hermon, and *Dārēyā*, ܕܪܝܐ, just south of Damascus. I do not know that this explanation of them has ever been given before.)

<sup>n</sup> This same form (without ܐ) in a papyrus record from Elephantine; Sachau, *op. cit.*, p. 41. The thoroughgoing Hebraism ܐܡܪ occurs some fifteen times in the papyri published by Sayce and Cowley.

<sup>o</sup> This also, similarly used, in the Egyptian papyri.

<sup>p</sup> The incorrect form of the name generally used by the Jews in the Greek period. Also vs. 14 and 6: 5.

<sup>q</sup> Babylonia, not Babylon.

<sup>r</sup> See above, on vs. 3.

<sup>s</sup> See above, on the proper names.

<sup>t</sup> The comments which have been made in recent years on the

אֱלֹהִי מֶאֱנִיָּא, שְׂא אֵזֶל אֶחָת הָמוּ בְּהִיכְלָא דִּי בִירוּשְׁלָם, וּבֵית  
 אֱלֹהָא יִתְבִּינָא עַל אֶתְרָהּ<sup>16</sup> ◦ אֲדִין שְׁשִׁבְצַר דִּךְ אֶתָּא יְהֹב אֲשִׁיָּא  
 דִּי בֵית אֱלֹהָא דִּי בִירוּשְׁלָם; וּמִן אֲדִין וְעַד כֶּעַן מִתְבִּינָא וּלְא שְׁלָם<sup>17</sup> ◦  
 וְכֶעַן הֵן עַל מַלְכָּא טָב, יִתְפַּקֵּר בְּבֵית גְּנֻזָּא<sup>18</sup> דִּי [סְפִרְיָא דִּי]<sup>19</sup>  
 מַלְכָּא תַּמְהָ, דִּי בַבְּבֵל<sup>20</sup>, הֵן אֶתִּי דִּי מִן כּוֹרֶשׁ מַלְכָּא שִׁים טַעַם  
 לְמִבְּנֵי בֵית אֱלֹהָא דִּךְ בִירוּשְׁלָם; וְרַעֲיוֹת מַלְכָּא עַל דְּנָה יִשְׁלַח עֲלֵינָא ◦  
 6<sup>1</sup> בְּאֲדִין דְּרִיּוֹשׁ מַלְכָּא שִׁים טַעַם, וּבְקִרְוֵי בְּבֵית גְּנֻזָּא<sup>21</sup> דִּי סְפִרְיָא  
 מִתְחַתִּין תַּמְהָ בַּבְּבֵל ◦<sup>22</sup> וְהִשְׁתַּכַּח בְּאַחְמֶתָא בְּבִירְתָּא דִּי בְּמִדִּי  
 מְדִינַתָּא<sup>23</sup> מְגִלָּה חֲדָה, וְכֵן כְּתִיב בְּגִיָּה: ◦  
 3<sup>3</sup> דְּכִרְוֹנָה<sup>24</sup>.<sup>(3)</sup> בְּשֵׁנַת חֲדָה לְכוֹרֶשׁ מַלְכָּא, כּוֹרֶשׁ מַלְכָּא שִׁים טַעַם:

text of this last clause are curious. As though שְׁשִׁבְצַר שְׁמִיָּה, "Sheshbazzar by name," were not faultless Aramaic! Marti, in the note appended to his text, suggests that שְׁמִיָּה may be a gloss (!!). Guthe, *Polychrome Bible*, decides that the word is the result of dittography (!) of the שְׁמִיָּה at the end of the verse; so also Bertholet, *Comm.* And so on.

<sup>16</sup> Not a Hebraism, as has long been known from the old Aramaic inscriptions. In Jewish Aramaic also in Jer. 10:11 and often in the Assuan papyri.

<sup>17</sup> This same phrase used in speaking of the Egyptian temple; Sachau, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

<sup>18</sup> Meyer, *Entstehung*, p. 44, thinks that the meaning of יְהֹב אֲשִׁיָּא is "problematisch"!

<sup>19</sup> Not passive, but the perf. *pe'al* of the stative verb.

<sup>20</sup> Plural, "store-houses," see the note on 4: 15.

<sup>21</sup> The emendation, and the reason for the loss of the words from the text, are alike obvious.

<sup>22</sup> Here again, בַּבְּל is the country, "Babylonia."

<sup>23</sup> The transposition is necessary, not merely for the sake of agreement with 5:17 (as emended), but in order to make sense.

<sup>24</sup> Marti, *Gramm.*, p. 45\*: "בְּמִדִּי מְדִינַתָּא" fehlt in LXX." What does he mean by this?

<sup>25</sup> זִכְרִין (the older form) similarly used in the Elephantine papyrus; Sachau, pp. 40 f.

בית אלהא בירושלם, ביתא יתבנא אתר די דבחין דבחין ואשירה<sup>†</sup>  
 מסובלין.<sup>‡</sup> רומה אמין שתין, פתיה אמין שתין: ◊ 'נדבכין די אבן  
 גלל תלתא, ונדבך די אע חדה<sup>§</sup>; ונפקתא מן בית מלכא תחיהב ◊  
 "ואה מִאֲנִי בית אלהא, די דהבה וּכְסָפָא, די נבוכדנצר הנפק מן  
 היכלא די בירושלם והיכל לבבל, יחיהבין: יהק<sup>‡</sup> להיכלא די  
 בירושלם לאתרה, וינחת<sup>‡</sup> בבית אלהא<sup>◊</sup>

\*

\*

\*

<sup>◊</sup> כִּנְן תַּתִּי פַחַת עֲבַר נַהֲרָה, שְׁתַּרְבּוּזִי, וּכְנָתְהוּן אֶפְרַסְיָא<sup>‡</sup> די

<sup>◊</sup> MT אֶשְׁרֵי. But many scholars since Ball (*Variorum Apocrypha*, 1892, p. 16) have seen that the word for "fire-offering" originally stood here, as also I Esdras translates. The form adopted (emphat. plur. written with ה) is the most likely one.

<sup>‡</sup>This is not a *po'al*, but a regularly formed *saph'el* from the root ובל, Heb. יבל, Assy. *abālu*, "bring." Cf. the use of the *hiph'il* הוביל, in speaking of bringing offerings to Yahwè; Ps. 68:30; 76:12, Zeph. 3:10.

<sup>§</sup> MT חדת, "new."

<sup>‡</sup> The *constructio ad sensum*, "and let it (all) come." Cf. the similar change of number in vs. 9, and the change of gender at the end of 5:8.

<sup>†</sup> MT וַתֵּהִי, but the second person is out of the question here. Read the *hoph'al* imperf. masc. (cf. Dan. 5:20), which is graphically almost the exact equivalent of the form in MT.

<sup>‡</sup> On the *lacuna* here, see above, p. 229. It is plain that at a very early date a passage of some length was accidentally dropped; probably because it resembled the preceding, and ended with the words בית אלהא.

<sup>‡</sup> It is common to "emend" this suffix to that of the second person, but no such alteration is required. When the persons directly addressed are not actually present, the Semitic often refers to them at the outset, in the formal address itself, with the *third* person, as here and in 4:17. Thus, for example, the כָּלָם in Micah 1:2; the یا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا etc. of the Koran; and many other instances.

<sup>‡</sup> See the note on 5:6.

בעבר נהרה, רְחִיקָן הוּל מִן תַּמָּה ◦ <sup>7</sup>שָׁקֶן לעבדת בית אלהא  
 דָּךְ פַּחַת יְהוּדִיָּא וּלְשׁוּבִי יְהוּדִיָּא: בֵּית אֱלֹהָא דָּךְ וּבִנּוֹן עַל אַחֲרֵיהָ ◦  
<sup>8</sup>וּמִנֵּי שִׁים טַעַם, לְמָא דִּי תַעֲבֹדוֹן עִם שׁוּבֵי יְהוּדִיָּא אֲלֶךְ לְמִבְנֵי  
 בֵּית אֱלֹהָא דָּךְ, וּמִנְכַּסִּי מַלְכָּא דִּי מִדַּת עֵבֶר נַהֲרָה אֶסְפֵּרְנָא נְפַחְתָּא  
 תְּהוּא מִתִּיהָבָא לְגַבְרִיָּא אֲלֶךְ, דִּי לֹא לְבַשְׁלָה ◦ <sup>9</sup>וּמָה תְּשַׁחֲן<sup>p</sup>, וּבְגִי<sup>q</sup>

The Chronicler

<sup>n</sup> The text of this verse is probably correct as it stands in MT, though the clauses are wrongly divided there. In this word וּלְשׁוּבִי, the ל is used exactly as it is in וּלְכָל, 7:28; i. e., in order to show how the construction is continued. In this instance, it shows that the noun is the direct object of the preceding verb, not the subject of the following verb, as it would otherwise pretty certainly be regarded. Jerome understood the verse as I have punctuated it. Marti, *Gramm.*, and Bertholet, *Comm.*, say that “LXX” omits יְהוּדִיָּא פַּחַת, which is not true; Kittel, *Bibl. Hebr.*, says that I Esdr. “inserts” לַעֲבֹד אֱלֹהָא זִרְבָּבֶל, which also is not true. Guthe’s restoration of the text here (*Polychrome Bible*) is a marvel.

<sup>o</sup> An explicative ו, meaning “even” or “namely,” was certainly used to a considerable extent in the Aramaic of this period. See vs. 9, וּבְנִי, and also my notes on I Esdr. 3:1, 6 (Vol. XXIII, p. 190).

<sup>p</sup> Generally regarded as plur. of a supposed fem. noun הַשְׁחָחָא, “need;” so Nöldeke in Kautzsch, *Gram. des bibl. Aram.*, p. 175. It seems to me more probable that it is the fem. plur. of the *pe’al* participle, with the meaning “needful.” The same form, in just this use, is common in Syriac; and the adjective, or its equivalent, is intrinsically much more probable here than a noun. The construction according to the sense, “whatever (things) are needful,” is certainly possible, especially for such a slovenly writer as this one; and the fem. is the gender to be expected. MT points אֲרַע, יֶהֱךְ for מִשָּׁח, יֶהֱךְ for מִשָּׁח, just as it points מִשָּׁח for מִשָּׁח, אֲרַע for אֲרַע, כְּתָב for כְּתָב, and many others; observe especially that this very participle is pointed תְּשַׁחֲן in Dan. 3:16, according to excellent testimony. And this all undoubtedly represents an actual (local or late) pronunciation.

<sup>q</sup> The “explicative” ו again; see the note on vs. 8. For this use of בְּנִי, cf. II Chron. 35:7.

תורין ודכרין ואמרין<sup>1</sup> לעלן לאלה שמיא. חנטין מלח חמר ומשח. כמאמר קהניא די בירושלם להנא מתיחב<sup>2</sup> להם יום ביום די לא שלו<sup>3</sup> ◦ די להון מהקרבין ניהוחין לאלה שמיא. ומצלן לחיי מלכא ובנוהי<sup>4</sup> ◦<sup>11</sup> ומני שים טעם, די כל אנש די יחשנא פתגמא דנה, יתנסח אע מן ביתה וזקיקה יתמיהא עלוהי, וביתה נולו יתעבד<sup>5</sup>, על דנה ◦<sup>12</sup> יאלהא די שכן שמה חמה ימגר<sup>6</sup> כל מלך ועם די ישלח ידה לחבלה<sup>7</sup> בית אלהא דך די בירושלם. אנה דריוש שמת טעם, אספרנא יתעבד ◦<sup>13</sup> אדין תחני פחת עבר נהרה, שתרבוזני וננותהון, לקבל די שלח דריוש מלכא כנמא אספרנא עבדו<sup>8</sup> ◦<sup>14</sup> ושבי יהודיא בנין ומצלחין, בנבואת חגי נביאה<sup>9</sup> וזכריה בר עדו. ובנו ושכללו מן טעם<sup>10</sup> אלה ישראל, ומטעים כורש ודריוש וארתחששתא מלך פָּרְסָא<sup>15</sup> ◦<sup>15</sup> ושיציא<sup>11</sup> ביתה דנה עד יום [עשרין ו] תלתה<sup>12</sup> לירח אדר: די

<sup>1</sup>Cf. 7:17, etc.

<sup>2</sup>For the change of gender and number, "let *it* (all) be given," cf. vs. 5, and the note there.

<sup>3</sup>For the reasons for ascribing these two verses to the Chronicler, see *Comp.*, p. 10.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Dan. 2:5; 3:29, and see *Harper Mem.*, Vol. II, 79.

<sup>5</sup>Both מגר and חבל, used as in this verse, in the Elephantine papyrus, ed. Sachau, I, l. 14.

<sup>6</sup>MT inserts להשניה before this word; plainly the *lapsus calami* of a scribe who remembered what he had just written in vs. 11.

<sup>7</sup>See the note on 5:1.

<sup>8</sup>Not "a Hebraism" (Marti). Both forms of the construct were in common use in the period from which our biblical Aramaic dates. So צלם and צלם, etc. The massoretic distinction between the "decree" of God and the "decree" of the friendly kings is natural enough.

<sup>9</sup>An addition carelessly made by some later hand.

<sup>10</sup>The orthography with נ may well be ancient; it is safest to retain it. As for the meaning, there is not the least room for doubt, in view of the common use of שִׁיָּצִי in later Jewish Aramaic, to mean "be finished," "come to an end." Merely an example of the stative *šaph'el* (שִׁיָּצִי, "escape," furnishes

היא<sup>ע</sup> שנת שת למלכות דריוש מלכא<sup>ו</sup> ◦ ויעבדו בני ישראל כהניא  
ולגריא ושאר בני גלותא חנפת בית אלהא דנה בחדוה ◦<sup>17</sup> וחקרבו  
לחנפת בית אלהא דנה תורין מאה, דכרין מאתין, אמרין ארבע  
מאה, וצפירי עזין לחשיא על כל ישראל תרי עשר, למנן שבטי  
ישראל ◦<sup>18</sup> והקימו כהניא בפלתהון, ולגריא במחלתהון, על  
עבדת [בית]<sup>ד</sup> אלהא די בירושלם, ככתב ספר משה, [ותרעיא  
לתרע ותרע<sup>ע</sup>] ◦

◦ ויעשו בני הגולה את הפסח בארבעה עשר לחדש הראשון<sup>19</sup> (Hebrew)  
<sup>20</sup> כי הטהרו וגו'

another example); cf. the note (d) on 4:13, above. So understood in I Esdr. 7:5, *συνετελέσθη ὁ οἶκος*. To "emend" to the plural would be a very foolish proceeding.

<sup>b</sup>The "twenty-third" day of the month, as is made nearly certain by I Esdras and Josephus (xi, 4, 7). The "twenty" might easily fall out by accident; it would hardly have been added. The following month, Nisan, was the natural one to select for the first complete restoration of the cultus, cf. Exod. 40:17 ff. This was the first month of the seventh year of Darius. According to the Chronicler (who always provides an exact date), after the people had finished building they still had a week left for the celebration, before the beginning of the new year.

<sup>c</sup>According to Meyer, *Entstehung*, 54, די דיא is "offenbar verstümmelt," and subsequent commentators have echoed this. As for the pronoun, the fem. is quite as natural as the masc., according to all Semitic usage, and undoubtedly stood here originally. And as for the connection: "namely, of the sixth year," there is not the least reason to object to it; nor would there be, even if the Chronicler were not its author. The ellipsis is a natural one.

<sup>d</sup>This word was probably dropped from the text by accident, at an early day. It cannot be dispensed with here.

<sup>e</sup>So I Esdras, at this point: *καὶ οἱ θυρωροὶ ἐφ' ἑκάστου πυλῶνος*, and Josephus also had these words before him. The words are the Chronicler's own (no one else would have been half so likely

## EZRA'S CREDENTIALS

(Ezr. 7:11-28)

The Chronicler (Hebrew) 11 וְזֶה פְּרִשְׁתָּן הַנִּשְׁתָּן אֲשֶׁר נָתַן הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲרֻחְשֶׁסְתָּא<sup>1</sup> לְעֹזְרָא  
הַכֹּהֵן הַסֹּפֵר, סֵפֶר דְּבָרֵי מַצּוֹת יְהוּדָה וְחֻקֵּי עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל ◯

The Chronicler (Aramaic) 12 אֲרֻחְשֶׁסְתָּא<sup>1</sup>, מֶלֶךְ מַלְכִּיא, לְעֹזְרָא כְּהֵנָא, סֵפֶר דָּתָא<sup>2</sup> דִּי אֱלֹהִי  
שְׁמִיא, [שְׁלָם]<sup>3</sup> גְּמִיר ◯ 13 וְכַעֲנָת: 13 מִנִּי שִׁים טַעֲם, דִּי כָל  
מִתְנַדֵּב בְּמַלְכוּתֵי מֶן עֲמָא יִשְׂרָאֵל וְכַהֲנוּדֵי וְלִנְיָא לְמִקְדָּשׁ לִירוּשָׁלַם  
עֲמָד, יִהְיֶה; ◯ 14 כָּל קַבְלֵי דִּי מֶן קִדְם מַלְכָא וְשִׁבְעַת יַעֲטָהּ שְׁלִיחָא<sup>4</sup>,

to write them), and they are in their original place, cf. II Chron. 8:14; 23:18 f.; 35:15. They were accidentally omitted by some one who thought that the verse ended with the reference to the "Book of Moses." The exact form of the words is made certain by the passages cited, and especially by the rendering of this same translator in II Chron. 35:15 = I Esdr. 1:15.

<sup>1</sup>On the orthography of this name see above, in the section on the proper names.

<sup>2</sup>Meyer, *Entstehung*, p. 61, writes: "Das Particip mit dem abhängigen Nomen סֵפֶר דָּתָא kann nichts anderes heissen als 'der das Gesetz geschrieben hat.'" He therefore concludes that Ezra is especially designated here, in this official document, as the author of the "Priest-Code." So far as grammar and usage are concerned, this observation is precisely as valuable as the one on pp. 16 f., in which he insists that עַל אֲרֻחְשֶׁסְתָּא, Ezr. 4:7, can only mean "against Artaxerxes." And as for the "Priest-Code," it is quite as purely a fiction of modern Old Testament learning as is the "Hexateuch," against which designation Meyer (pp. 216 ff.) rightly declaims. There was a priestly expansion and redaction of the law (which took place in Palestine, not in Babylonia); but when once the true origin and character of the Ezra story are recognized, there is not a scrap of evidence, external or internal, tending to show that any separate "priestly law-book" ever existed.

<sup>3</sup>The emendation is certain.

<sup>4</sup>See the note (e) on 4:14.

<sup>5</sup>The omission of the subject (the pron. of the second pers.

לבקרה על יהוד ולירושלם<sup>1</sup>, בדת אלהך די בידך: ◊<sup>15</sup> ולהיבילה  
 כסך ודהב, די מלכא ויעשוהי התנביו לאלה ישראל, די בירושלם  
 משפניה: ◊<sup>16</sup> וכל כסך ודהב די תהשפח בכל מדינת בבל: עם  
 התנביות עמא וכהניא, מתנבין<sup>17</sup> לבית אלהים<sup>18</sup> די בירושלם ◊<sup>19</sup>  
 כל קבל דנה, אספרנא<sup>20</sup> תקנא בכספא דנה תורין דכרין אמרין  
 ומנתהון ונספיהון, ותקרב<sup>21</sup> המו על מדבחא די בית אלהים<sup>22</sup> די  
 בירושלם ◊<sup>23</sup> ומה<sup>24</sup> די עליך ועל אחיך ייטב בשאר כספא ודהבה  
 למעבד, כרעות אלהים תעבדון ◊<sup>25</sup> ומאניא די מתנבין לך לפלחן  
 בית אלהך, השלים קדם אלה ירושלם<sup>26</sup> ◊<sup>27</sup> ושאר חשנות<sup>28</sup> בית  
 אלהך די יפל לך למנת, תנתן מן בית גנזי מלכא ◊<sup>29</sup>  
<sup>30</sup>ומניי אנה ארתחשסתא מלכא שים טעם לכל גזבריא<sup>31</sup> די בעבר  
 נהרה, די כל די ישאלנכון עזרא כהנא, ספר דתא די אלה שמיא.

sing.) is very awkward, but is also very characteristic. See Driver, *Introd.*, list of the Chronicler's peculiar syntactical usages, No. 27. A good parallel, e. g., is II Chron. 19:6 (end): "and [he is] with you in the judgment." So also 18:3, etc.

<sup>1</sup>The characteristic use of ל in continuing the force of another proposition previously used; see the note (n) on 6:7; also above, p. 18, n. i, and below, vs. 28.

<sup>15</sup>Accusative of condition.

<sup>16</sup>See the note on this suffix in 5:3.

<sup>17</sup>See above, on the foreign words.

<sup>18</sup>The *pa'el*, in this sense, is more common than the *aph'el* in Aramaic, whether Jewish or Christian. To "emend" here is pure vandalism.

<sup>19</sup>Cf. the beginning of 6:9.

<sup>20</sup>"The god of Jerusalem;" the Chronicler is fond of making the foreign kings speak in this way; cf. vs. 15, and 1:3. The I Esdras Greek has accidentally lost four words here (8:17): *καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ σκεύη τὰ διδόμενά σοι εἰς τὴν χρεῖαν τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ θεοῦ σου [παράδος ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ] τοῦ ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ*. The L text is "edited" beyond recognition, as usual.

<sup>21</sup>Cf. the beginning of 6:9.

<sup>22</sup>Perhaps best pointed (on good manuscript authority) גזבריא. See above, on the foreign words.



אֶסְפֵּרנָא יתְעַבֵּד: <sup>22</sup> עַד כִּסֶּה כְּפִרְיָן מֵאָה, וְעַד חֲנֻטְיָן כּוֹרִין מֵאָה, וְעַד חֲמִיר בְּחִין מֵאָה; וְעַד בְּחִין מִשָּׁה" מֵאָה, וּמִלֵּחַ דִּי לֹא כְּתֹב <sup>23</sup> כֹּל דִּי מִן טַעַם אֱלֹהִי שְׂמִיָּא, יתְעַבֵּד אֶרְדּוּדָא לְבֵית אֱלֹהִי שְׂמִיָּא; דִּי לְמַה לְהֻנָּא קֶצֶה עַל מִלְכּוּת מִלְכָּא וּבְנוּדִי <sup>24</sup> וְלִכְּסָם מִהוּדַעִין, דִּי כֹל כְּהֻנָּיָא וְלִוְיָא זְמָרְיָא תְּרַעִיָּא נְתִינָא וּפְלַחִי בֵּית אֱלֹהִי דְנָה, מְנַדָּה בְּלֹו וְהֻלְךְ" לֹא שְׁלִיט לְמַרְמָא עֲלֵיהֶם <sup>25</sup> וְאַנְתָּא, עֲזֹרָא, כְּחֻכְמַת אֱלֹהִי דִּי בִידֵךְ, מְנִי שְׁפִטִין וְדִינִין דִּי לְהוֹן דְּאִנִּין לְכָל עֲמָא דִּי בַעֲבֵר נְהֻרָה, לְכָל יִדְעִיָּא דָּתָא אֱלֹהִי, וְדִי לֹא יָדַע תְּהוּדַעִין <sup>26</sup> וְכָל דִּי לֹא לְהֻנָּא עָבַד דָּתָא דִּי אֱלֹהִי וְדָתָא דִּי מִלְכָּא, אֶסְפֵּרנָא דִּינָה לְהֻנָּא מִתְעַבֵּד מִנֵּה, הֵן לְמוֹת הֵן לְשִׁרְשׁוֹד

<sup>22</sup>Even the Chronicler should be permitted sometimes to vary the form of his phrases. The wording of MT here is not in the least objectionable (cf. I Kings 18:32, for example), and it is not even clear that Theodotion had a different text.

<sup>23</sup>See above, on the foreign words.

<sup>24</sup>The same phrase in 4:13, 20.

<sup>25</sup>The one place in the Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra where the original consonant text appears to have written this pronoun without final ה (Strack, *Gramm. des Bibl.-Aram.*<sup>3</sup>, p. 8\*). The shorter form is found in the Egyptian papyri of the fifth century B. C.

<sup>26</sup>Cf. the orthography in Dan. 2:38; 3:3, etc.

<sup>27</sup>This refers to the people, not to the judges.

<sup>28</sup>MT דָּתִי; but the plural does not seem to have been read by any of the translators. Probably a copyist's mistake, caused by the ending of the preceding word.

<sup>29</sup>This is the best reading, even if the I Esdras translator really had the singular before him. Those who were to "teach" were Ezra and these lieutenants of his, whose office was imagined as something like that of an itinerant bishop.

<sup>30</sup>See my note on I Esdr. 4:39; Vol. XXIII, 130.

<sup>31</sup>Vocalization uncertain. שְׁרִישִׁי, the abstract formed from the *pe'il* verbal adjective, is perhaps as likely as anything. *Qerē* שְׁרִישִׁי.

הָן לַעֲנֵשׁ נְכֶסֶךְ וְלֶאֱסוּרִין ○

27 בְּרוּךְ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵינוּ, אֲשֶׁר נָתַן כְּזֹאת בְּלִבּ הַמֶּלֶךְ, לִפְאֹר  
אֶת בֵּית יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר בִּירוּשָׁלַם: ○ 28 וְעַל הַשָּׂה חֶסֶד לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ  
וַיַּעֲצִיר וּלְכָל שָׂרֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ הַגְּבֵרִים. וְאֵנִי הַתְּחַזְּקִיתִי, כִּי יְהוָה  
אֱלֹהֵי עָלֵי, וַאֲקַבֵּצָה מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל רָאשִׁים לַעֲלֹת עִמִּי ○

The Chronicler  
(Hebrew)

<sup>e</sup>This word, with the meaning "goods," also in the Assuan papyri.

<sup>f</sup>This joyful exclamation, following immediately upon the letter, without the necessity of any intervening narrative, is the best single illustration of the extent to which the Chronicler identifies himself with his Ezra, the hero whom he has created. Cf. Neh. 12:36!

<sup>g</sup>See the note (1) on vs. 14.

<sup>h</sup>The adjective "good" (derived from vs. 9) is added here in the later form of the text which was rendered by Theodotion. The old Greek version agrees with MT.

#### TRANSLATION

4<sup>f</sup>Then the people of the land<sup>i</sup> kept weakening the hands of the people of Judea, and disquieting them in their building, <sup>5</sup>and hiring counselors<sup>i</sup> against them, to frustrate their purpose, all the days of Cyrus<sup>i</sup> king of Persia.<sup>k</sup>

The Chronicler  
(Hebrew)

<sup>6</sup>And in the reign of Xerxes, at the beginning of his reign, Bishlam, Mithradates, Tab'el, and the rest of his companions, wrote an accusation against the inhabitants of Judea and Jerusalem.

<sup>7</sup>And in the days of Artaxerxes,<sup>1</sup> Rehum the reporter<sup>m</sup> and

<sup>i</sup>See above, the notes on the Hebrew text.

<sup>k</sup>MT adds, "and until the reign of Darius king of Persia." See the note on the Hebrew text.

<sup>1</sup>That is, the king whose reign immediately followed that of Xerxes, just as that of Xerxes was believed to have immediately followed that of Cyrus; see above.

<sup>m</sup>In the reorganization, by Darius I, of the Persian provincial government, an official was created whose especial business it was to report to the

Shimshai the scribe wrote to Artaxerxes king of Persia; and the text of the letter was written in Aramaic, and translated.<sup>n</sup>

Aramaic  
Writer

<sup>8</sup> *Rehum the reporter and Shimshai the scribe wrote a letter against Jerusalem to Artaxerxes the king, as follows.* <sup>9</sup> Then Rehum the reporter and Shimshai the scribe, and the rest of their companions, the Dinaites, the Apharsathkites, the men of Tetrapolis, the Persians, the men of Erech, the Babylonians, and the men of Susa, who are Elamites, <sup>10</sup> and the rest of the peoples which the great and illustrious Shalmanassar transported, and made to dwell in the cities of Samaria and the rest of the province Beyond the River; — this is the copy of the letter which they sent to him.

*To Artaxerxes the king; thy servants, the men from Beyond the River, (send greeting.)*<sup>o</sup> <sup>12</sup> *To proceed: (12) Be it known to the king, that the Jews who went up from thee<sup>p</sup> came to us. Jerusalem, the rebellious and wicked city, they are building; they are completing the walls, and laying the foundations.* <sup>13</sup> *Now be it known to the king, that if that city shall be built and its walls completed, they will pay no tribute, tax, nor custom, and the royal taxation will suffer damage.* <sup>14</sup> *Now inasmuch as we have eaten of the salt of the palace, and it is not fitting for us to see the king's hurt, for this reason we hereby send and make the matter known to the king,* <sup>15</sup> *so that search may be made in the record-books<sup>q</sup> of thy fathers; and thou wilt find in the record-books and learn, that that city hath been a rebellious city, and one causing damage to kings and provinces, and that insurrection hath been made therein since the days of old; therefore was that city laid waste.* <sup>16</sup> *We make known to the king, that if that city shall be built and its*

king the progress of affairs in each satrapy (Nöldeke, *Aufsätze zur persischen Geschichte*, 33 f.). It is this officer who is intended here by the title בעל טעם; cf. the use of טעמא in 5:5. The old Greek translator, who rendered ὁ γράφων τὰ προπληροῦντα, lived at a time in which the recollection of these government officials was still preserved.

<sup>n</sup> That is, translated *into Hebrew*; there is no other natural or possible interpretation. The narrator supposed that the Jews of the time of Artaxerxes I did not know Aramaic well.

<sup>o</sup> The word of greeting is not present in our text, but may be understood.

<sup>p</sup> That is, "from thy land," Babylonia. The reference is to the expedition in the days of Cyrus, to which indirect allusion is again made in the following chapters. See above, p. 232.

<sup>q</sup> Plural number, not singular; see the note on the text.

walls completed, as a result thou wilt have no part in the province Beyond the River.<sup>f</sup>

<sup>17</sup> The king returned answer:

To Rehum the reporter and Shimshai the scribe, and the rest of their<sup>g</sup> companions who dwell in Samaria and in the remainder of the province Beyond the River, greeting. <sup>18</sup> To proceed: <sup>(18)</sup> The letter which ye sent to us was plainly read before me. <sup>19</sup> And I gave command, and they made search, and found that that city from days of old hath risen against kings, and rebellion and insurrection have been made therein. <sup>20</sup> And over Jerusalem were mighty kings, ruling also in all the province Beyond the River; and tribute, tax, and custom were paid to them.<sup>h</sup> <sup>21</sup> Now therefore give command to restrain those men; and let that city not be built, until from me command be given. <sup>22</sup> And be ye careful not to deal negligently in this matter, lest the harm be increased to the damage of the kingdom.<sup>i</sup>

<sup>23</sup> Thereupon, as soon as the copy of the letter of Artaxerxes the king was read before Rehum and Shimshai the scribe, and their companions, they went in haste to Jerusalem against the Jews, and restrained them by force of arms.<sup>j</sup> <sup>24</sup> Then was stopped the work upon the house of God in Jerusalem, and it remained at a standstill until the second year of the reign of Darius king of Persia.

**5<sup>1</sup>** But Haggai the prophet, and Zechariah the son of Iddo, uttered a prophecy for the Jews who were in Judea and Jerusalem, in the name of the God of Israel which<sup>k</sup> was over them. <sup>2</sup> Thereupon rose up Zerubbabel the son of Shealtiel and Jeshua the son

<sup>f</sup> I. e., the glory of the days of David and Solomon will return, and the Jews will rule over all Samaria and Syria.

<sup>g</sup> So, frequently, the third person rather than the second, in Semitic usage. See the note on the text of 6: 6.

<sup>h</sup> No Persian king or official could ever have written this verse, nor anything resembling it. It is, on the contrary, an illustration of the old familiar custom of the Jewish writers of the last centuries B. C., to give glory to their city, and their temple, and themselves, by proxy.

<sup>i</sup> Lit., "to the damage of kings."

<sup>j</sup> Lit., "by arm and (military) force."

<sup>k</sup> Cf. Deut. 28: 10, etc.

of Jozadak, and began<sup>x</sup> to build the house of God in Jerusalem, and with them were the prophets of God helping them.

<sup>3</sup>At that time there came to them Tattenai, governor of the province Beyond the River, and Shetharbozenai,<sup>y</sup> and their companions, and thus they said to them: Who hath given you command to build this house, and to complete this colonnade?<sup>z</sup> <sup>4</sup>They also asked<sup>a</sup> them: What are the names of the men who are building this building? <sup>5</sup>But the eye of their God was upon the elders of the Jews, and they did not stop them, until the report should come to Darius and thereupon a message be returned in regard to the matter.

<sup>6</sup>The copy of the letter which Tattenai, governor of the province Beyond the River, and Shetharbozenai, and his companions, the eparchs who were in the province Beyond the River, sent to Darius the king. <sup>7</sup>They sent him a communication, and thus was written in it:

To Darius the king, all peace. <sup>8</sup>Be it known to the king, that we went to the province of Judea, to the house of the great God; and it is being built with great stones, and wood is put into the walls; and the work is done diligently, and prospers in their hands. <sup>9</sup>Then we questioned those elders,<sup>b</sup> and thus we said to them: Who hath given you command to build this house, and to complete this colonnade?<sup>c</sup> <sup>10</sup>Moreover, we asked of them their names, in order to make them known to thee, so that we might write down the names of the men who are at their head. <sup>11</sup>And thus they made reply to us, saying: We are the servants of the God of heaven and earth, and are rebuilding a house which was erected many years ago, one which a great king of Israel built and completed. <sup>12</sup>But because our fathers angered the God

<sup>x</sup>See the note on the Aramaic text. The phrase here implies nothing more than the words of Haggai 1:14: "they came and did work on the house of Yahwè."

<sup>y</sup>The traditional pronunciation; but see above, on the proper names.

<sup>z</sup>The meaning of the Aramaic word is uncertain. See above, on the foreign words.

<sup>a</sup>MT, "then thus we said to them;" see the note on the text.

<sup>b</sup>This would indeed be a singular expression for the hostile officials to use!

<sup>c</sup>See the note in vs. 3.

of heaven, he gave them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, the Chaldean; and he destroyed this house, and carried away the people captive to Babylonia. <sup>13</sup>But in the first year of Cyrus king of Babylon, Cyrus the king gave command to build this house of God. <sup>14</sup>Also the vessels of the house of God, of gold and of silver, which Nebuchadnezzar had taken away from the temple in Jerusalem and brought to the temple in Babylon, Cyrus the king brought out from the temple in Babylon and delivered to one named Sheshbazzar, whom he had made governor. <sup>15</sup>And he said to him: Take these vessels, and go, deposit them in the temple which is in Jerusalem; and let the house of God be built upon its (former) site. <sup>16</sup>Then came that Sheshbazzar and laid the foundations of the house of God in Jerusalem; and from that time until now it hath been building, but is not completed.

<sup>17</sup>Now therefore, if it seem good to the king, let search be made in the storehouses<sup>d</sup> in which are the royal documents,<sup>e</sup> in Babylonia,<sup>f</sup> to see whether it be true that command was given by Cyrus the king to build that house of God in Jerusalem; and let the king send to us his pleasure in the matter.

**6**<sup>1</sup>Then Darius the king gave command, and they made search in the storehouses in Babylonia<sup>1</sup> where the documents<sup>2</sup> were deposited. <sup>2</sup>And in the citadel at Ecbatana, which is in the province of Media, there was found a certain scroll;<sup>h</sup> and thus was written in it:

<sup>3</sup>MEMORANDUM. <sup>(3)</sup>In the first year of Cyrus the king, King Cyrus gave order: As for the house of God in Jerusalem, let the house be built in the place where they offer sacrifices and bring the burnt offerings. Its height shall be sixty cubits and its breadth sixty cubits. <sup>4</sup>Let there be three courses of great stones, and one course of wood; and let the expense be paid from the king's house. <sup>5</sup>Also the vessels of the house of God, of gold and of silver, which Nebuchadnezzar took away from the temple in

<sup>d</sup> Plural number, not singular.

<sup>e</sup> MT has accidentally lost two words here.

<sup>f</sup> Not "Babylon."

<sup>g</sup> MT, "the libraries in B. where the treasures were deposited."

<sup>h</sup> *Encycl. Bibl.*, II, 1481 middle: "i. e., the cuneiform tablet!"

*Jerusalem and brought to Babylon, let them restore; and let it (all) come to the temple in Jerusalem, to its place, and be deposited in the house of God.<sup>i</sup>*

\* \* \* \* \*

<sup>6</sup>*Now Tattenai, governor of the province Beyond the River, Shetharbozenai, and their<sup>k</sup> companions, the eparchs who are in the province Beyond the River, be ye far from thence. <sup>7</sup>Leave the governor of the Jews and the elders of the Jews free to work upon that house of God; let them build that house of God in its place. <sup>8</sup>And I hereby give command, in regard to whatever ye shall do in co-operation with those Jewish elders toward building that house of God, that out of the royal revenue from the tribute of the province Beyond the River the expense be diligently paid to those men, without fail.*

<sup>9</sup>*And whatever things are needful, such as young bullocks, rams, and lambs, for whole-burnt-offerings to the God of heaven; wheat, salt, wine, and oil; according to the word of the priests who are in Jerusalem let it (all) be given to them, day by day, without negligence; <sup>10</sup>so that they may offer pleasant offerings to the God of heaven, and pray for the life of the king and his sons.<sup>1</sup>*

<sup>11</sup>*And I have made a decree, that if any man alter this edict, a beam shall be pulled out of his house and he shall be impaled thereon, and his house shall be made a dunghill, in punishment for this. <sup>12</sup>And may the God who hath made his name to dwell there overthrow any king or people who shall put forth a hand to destroy<sup>m</sup> that house of God which is in Jerusalem. I, Darius, have given command; let it be diligently performed.*

<sup>13</sup>*Then Tattenai, governor of the province Beyond the River, Shetharbozenai, and their companions, according to the word which Darius the king had sent, thus they did diligently. <sup>14</sup>And the elders of the Jews built and prospered, through the prophecy of Haggai the prophet and Zechariah the son of Iddo. And they*

<sup>i</sup> On the lacuna at this point, see above, p. 229.

<sup>k</sup> See the note on 4:17.

<sup>1</sup> Vss. 9 f. are the work of the Chronicler; see above.

<sup>m</sup> MT, "to change, to destroy."

completed their building<sup>n</sup> by the command of the God of Israel, and by the order of Cyrus, and Darius, and Artaxerxes king of Persia.

<sup>15</sup> And this house was finished on the [twenty-]third day of the month Adar, of the sixth year of the reign of Darius the king.

The Chronicler  
(Aramaic)

<sup>16</sup> And the children of Israel, the priests, and the Levites, and the rest of the children of the captivity performed the dedication of this house of God with joy. <sup>17</sup> And they offered, for the dedication of this house of God, one hundred bullocks, two hundred rams, and four hundred lambs; and for a sin offering for all Israel twelve he-goats, according to the number of the tribes of Israel.

<sup>18</sup> And they stationed the priests in their divisions, and the Levites in their courses, for the service of [the house of] God which is in Jerusalem, according to the prescription of the book of Moses, [and the porters were at every gate].

<sup>19</sup> And the children of the captivity observed the passover in the fourteenth day of the first month.

(Hebrew)

(*The remaining verses (20–22) of the chapter give a brief account, in Hebrew, of this passover. Then follows the introduction to the story of Ezra, 7:1–10, this also composed by the Chronicler, and written in Hebrew. Vs. 11 introduces the “letter of Artaxerxes.”*)

<sup>7</sup><sup>11</sup> And this is the copy of the letter which Artaxerxes<sup>o</sup> the king gave to Ezra the priest, the scribe, learned in the words of the ordinances of Yahwè and his statutes for Israel:

The Chronicler  
(Hebrew)

<sup>12</sup> Artaxerxes, king of kings, to Ezra the priest, the scribe of the law of the God of heaven, perfect [peace]. <sup>13</sup> To proceed: <sup>(13)</sup> I have made a decree, that any one in my kingdom, of the people of Israel, and its priests, and the Levites, who shall freely offer to go with thee to Jerusalem,<sup>p</sup> may go; <sup>14</sup> inasmuch as thou art sent by the king and his seven counselors, to make investigation<sup>q</sup> regard-

The Chronicler  
(Aramaic)

<sup>n</sup> Lit., “and they built and completed.”

<sup>o</sup> I. e., according to the Chronicler, Artaxerxes II; to whose reign he also assigns the story of Nehemiah. See above.

<sup>p</sup> On the very striking resemblance of this letter, in its substance and its phraseology, to the similar documents (also composed by the Chronicler) in Ezr. 1:3–6 and I Esdr. 4:47–56, see above, p. 228.

<sup>q</sup> In what follows it is made plain that the mission of Ezra included also the institution of any needed reforms.



ing Judea and Jerusalem in accordance with the law of thy God which is in thy hand; <sup>15</sup>and to carry the silver and gold which the king and his counselors have vowed to the God of Israel, whose dwelling is in Jerusalem; <sup>16</sup>as well as all the silver and gold which thou shalt find in all the province of Babylonia;<sup>r</sup> together with the free-will offering of the people and the priests, which they vow for the house of their God which is in Jerusalem. <sup>17</sup>Thou shalt therefore purchase diligently, with this money, bullocks, rams, and lambs, besides their meal offerings and their drink offerings, and thou shalt offer them upon the altar of the house of your God which is in Jerusalem. <sup>18</sup>And whatsoever shall seem good to thee and to thy brethren to do with the rest of the silver and gold, ye may do according to the good pleasure of your God. <sup>19</sup>And the vessels which are given to thee for the service of the house of thy God, deliver in the presence of the God of Jerusalem.<sup>s</sup> <sup>20</sup>And whatever other requirement of the house of thy God it may happen to thee to bestow, thou mayest bestow it out of the king's treasury.

<sup>21</sup>And I, Artaxerxes the king, hereby issue a decree, to all the treasurers of the province Beyond the River; that whatever Ezra the priest, the scribe of the law of the God of heaven, shall require of you, let it be done diligently; <sup>22</sup>unto a hundred talents of silver, and to a hundred measures of wheat, and to a hundred measures of wine, and to a hundred measures of oil, and salt without prescription (of the amount). <sup>23</sup>Whatsoever is by the command of the God of heaven, let it be done diligently<sup>t</sup> for the house of the God of heaven; lest wrath come upon the reign of the king and his sons. <sup>24</sup>And to you notice is hereby given, that upon no one of the priests or Levites, singers, porters, Nethinim, or (other) servants of this house of God, is it permitted to impose tribute, tax, or custom.<sup>u</sup>

<sup>r</sup>This apparently refers to contributions solicited from people of the province who were not Jews.

<sup>s</sup>See the note on the Aramaic text.

<sup>t</sup>The word is quite unknown, but this is its evident meaning.

<sup>u</sup>The gifts and prerogatives promised in the document thus far make a list which is not quite incredible in itself; it is rather the form in which it is all cast that betrays with certainty the Jewish authorship. It is interesting to compare the imaginary letter from Demetrius Soter to the Jews, "quoted"

<sup>25</sup> And do thou, Ezra, according to the wisdom of God which is in thy hand, appoint magistrates and judges, who shall judge all the people of the province Beyond the River,<sup>v</sup> all who know the law of thy God; and those who do not know it ye shall teach. <sup>26</sup> And whoever will not observe the law of thy God and the law of the king, let judgment be executed diligently upon him; whether unto death, or to banishment, or to confiscation of goods, or to imprisonment.

---

<sup>27</sup> Blessed<sup>w</sup> be Yahwè, the God of our fathers, who put such a thing as this into the heart of the king, to beautify the house of Yahwè which is in Jerusalem; <sup>28</sup> and gave me favor in the eyes of the king and his counselors, and all the mighty officers of the king. So I strengthened myself, by virtue of the hand of Yahwè my God which was over me, and gathered out of Israel chief men<sup>x</sup> to go up with me.

The Chronicler  
(Hebrew)

in I Macc. 10:26-45, where the author of that history deliberately sets himself the task of composing such a list of royal grants and concessions as should be truly "incredible" (cf. vs. 46).

But in the final paragraph of the Artaxerxes edict, where the king formally adopts the law of Moses for the Jews of all Syria and Palestine, and gives Ezra and the officers appointed by him free hand to enforce this law throughout the whole Transflumen(!), with power to imprison, confiscate, banish, and execute the death penalty, it is plain that even the last vestige of probability is gone.

<sup>v</sup> Meyer, *Entstehung*, p. 67, argues that this phrase means (and presumably it does, since the Chronicler wrote it) the Jewish community in the Transflumen, "oder wie wir sagen würden Palästina"(!), and then adds, that the Jews of Palestine occupied only the one compact settlement in Judea. That is, כל עמא די בעבר נהרה is by these successive steps reduced to mean only the Jewish church in Judea! This is convenient reasoning, but in view of the constant use of the term "Beyond the River" in express contrast with Judea, all through Ezra and Nehemiah, the argument cannot stand.

<sup>w</sup> See the note on the text.

<sup>x</sup> Cf. especially Ezr. 1:5 and I Esdr. 5:1. These "chief men" of Israel are sure to appear wherever the Chronicler is the writer.